

Concordia Theological Monthly

Vol. XX

MAY, 1949

No. 5

Johann Lorenz Mosheim's Philosophy of History

By LEWIS SPITZ, JR.

History as record and interpretation, just as history as past actuality, has been in constant change. *Tempora mutantur, et nos mutamur in illis* is the inexorable law of life and of living academic disciplines as well. The history of historiography powerfully demonstrates the truism that each generation writes its own history. As the world view of humanity changes, the new criteria of evaluating the human story necessitates a reworking of the history of the past.¹

If modern genetic history has demonstrated anything, it is that great caution should mark the assignment of the absolute beginning of any historic development. Nevertheless, even in historiography itself men have not hesitated to label Herodotus the "father of history" and Bede the "father of English History" or to date the beginning of modern history from Niebuhr. While there is no special profit beyond that of employing a pleasant aphorism in ascribing intellectual paternity to certain historians, the consistent use of this device in historiographic literature at least emphasizes that certain times have witnessed particularly great changes in historiography. These have not been times when men merely excelled their predecessors in their own methods, but times of fundamental change in outlook. At such a point in the development of historical writing stood Johann Lorenz Mosheim.

Mosheim has been highly and variously praised in our

¹ Emil Menke-Glueckert, *Die Geschichtsschreibung der Reformation und Gegenreformation* (Leipzig, 1912), p. 1.

day as well as in his. Gesner, the distinguished philologist at the University of Goettingen during Mosheim's chancellorship, wrote, "Ubi Moshemius, ibi academia," and Gellert called him "die Ehre seines Jahrhunderts."² Others since have called him the foremost historian of his age,³ a great historian,⁴ the author of the best church history of the 18th century,⁵ superior to all preceding Lutheran writers,⁶ among the greatest historians of all times,⁷ the author of epoch-making works,⁸ the acknowledged master of church history writing,⁹ the most outstanding historian,¹⁰ the shining star of 18th century church history,¹¹ and, most frequently, the "father of modern church history."¹²

This chorus of adulation at once indicates an intrinsic merit in Mosheim's writing and suggests a special significance in the development of historical composition. The age of controversy and the age of erudition were giving way to the beginnings of scientific church history. Not only has Mosheim been credited with being instrumental in reviving interest in church history as an academic discipline,¹³ but also with writ-

² Gustav Frank, *Geschichte der Protestantischen Theologie*, II (Leipzig, 1865), p. 223.

³ Albert Henry Newman, *A Manual of Church History* (Philadelphia, 1901), p. 536.

⁴ Johann Michael Mehligs, *Kurzgefasste Kirchengeschichte* (Chemnitz, 1767), p. 550.

⁵ Hans Leube, *Die Reformideen in der Deutschen Lutherischen Kirche zur Zeit der Orthodoxie* (Leipzig, 1924), p. 21.

⁶ Article "History, Ecclesiastical," *The Catholic Encyclopaedia*, VII, (New York, 1910), p. 377.

⁷ James Thompson Shotwell, "History," *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, XI (London, 1937), p. 596.

⁸ Karl Heussi, *Kompndium der Kirchengeschichte* (Tuebingen, 1937), p. 3.

⁹ Karl Hase, *Theologisch-Akademische Lehrschriften* (Leipzig, 1841), p. 9.

¹⁰ Heinrich Hermelink and Horst Stephan, *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte, Reformation, Gegenreformation und Neuzeit* (Tuebingen, 1912), p. 71.

¹¹ Johann Heinrich Kurtz, *Church History*, I (New York, 1888), p. 15.

¹² Cf. K. R. Hagenbach, *History of the Church in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries*, I (New York, 1869), p. 258; Karl Heussi, "Mosheim," *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, IV (Tuebingen, 1930), p. 247; Albert Henry Newman, *op. cit.*, I, p. 14; Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, I (New York, 1920), p. 39.

¹³ Harry Elmer Barnes, *A History of Historical Writing* (Norman, Okla., 1937), p. 248.

ing the first scientific¹⁴ and comprehensive church history.¹⁵ He was well prepared for scholarly work.

Born in 1693, Mosheim was the son of Ferdinand Sigismund Mosheim, a Catholic and a descendant of Rupert von Mosham, a radical of Luther's day.¹⁶ His mother, a Protestant, reared her two sons in the Lutheran faith.¹⁷ Upon his father's death, Mosheim was apprenticed to a merchant, but Princess Elisabeth Sophie Marie, the widow of Prince Adolf August von Holstein-Ploen, later Duchess of Braunschweig-Wolfenbuettel, provided the means necessary for him to attend the Catharineum, the Latin school of Luebeck.¹⁸ In 1714 he began tutoring in Holstein, in Suelfeld, southwest of Luebeck, and even while in this relatively obscure position, he corresponded with Pastor Kaspar Starck, author of the *Luebeckische Kirchenhistorie*, J. G. Carpzov, Christian Joecher of Leipzig, Herman Reimarus, and Johann Christoph Wolf of Hamburg, as he later did with Franz Buddeus of Jena and Gottfried Wil-

¹⁴ Georg Weber, *Allgemeine Weltgeschichte*, XII (Leipzig, 1887), p. 923.

¹⁵ *The Cambridge Modern History*, XII (New York, 1902, p. 817.

¹⁶ There have been at least eight biographies of Mosheim in addition to many articles of a biographical nature. The oldest is that by Gabriel Wilhelm Goetten, *Das jetzlebende gelehrte Europa*, I, 1735, pp. 717ff.; next in order is Johann Jacob Moser, *Beytrag zu einem Lexico der jetzlebenden lutherischen und reformirten Theologen*, 1740, pp. 511ff.; Jacob Bruecker, *Pinacotheca scriptorum illustrium*, 1741; Johann Moller, *Cibria litterata*, 1744, I, pp. 447ff.; Johann Matth. Gesner, *Memoria Johann Laurenz Moshemii*, 1755, reprinted in the *Biographia Academica Gottengensis*, 1768; Christian David Jani, *Johann Peter Nicerons Nachrichten von den Begebenheiten und Schriften berühmter Gelehrten*, 1771, XXIII, pp. 406ff., reputedly the best of the 18th century; Friedrich Luecke, *Narratio de Joanne Laurentio Moshemio*, 1837. Unfortunately these early biographies are for the most part inaccessible outside the Continent. By far the most complete biography of Mosheim is that by Karl Heussi, *Johann Lorenz Mosheim, Ein Beitrag zur Kirchengeschichte des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts* (Tuebingen, 1906). Heussi not only used the older biographies, but had access also to the many manuscripts, documents, and letters which constitute the best sources for Mosheim's life.

¹⁷ A. Nebe, *Zur Geschichte der Predigt; Characterbilder der bedeutendsten Kanzelredner in der evangelischen Kirche Deutschlands von Luther bis Albertini* (Wiesbaden, 1879), p. 138. Even the year of his birth remained indefinitely fixed until the present century. A. Nebe, *op. cit.*, p. 138, gave the date as 1693 or 1694 and J. Wagenmann, "Mosheim," *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, XXII (Leipzig, 1875-1910), p. 395, as 1694 or 1695. Karl Heussi discovered the recording of his birth by his father in the family Housebook as Oct. 9, 1693, *Johann Lorenz Mosheim*, p. 15, note 2.

¹⁸ F. C. Schlosser, *History of the Eighteenth Century and of the Nineteenth till the Overthrow of the French Empire* (London, 1845), pp. 48 ff. On the Catharineum, cf. *Das Akademische Deutschland*, I (Berlin, 1930), p. 475.

helm Leibniz. In the fall of 1715 two Holstein noblemen, the *Landrat* von Alefeld and the *Amtmann* von Wedderkopp, made it possible for Mosheim to attend Kiel University.¹⁹ Here he became an assistant to the philosophical faculty and in 1721 was named professor of logic and metaphysics.²⁰ Due to the Northern War, the court fled to Petersburg, and his commissioning never took place.²¹ Instead, his former patroness, the Duchess Elisabeth Sophie Marie, had him called to the University of Helmstedt, where he remained for twenty-four years, instructing in church history and eventually receiving the vice-presidency of the University.²² Mosheim reached the climax of his academic career with his acceptance of the chancellorship of the University of Goettingen in 1747, a position which actually allowed him additional freedom for scholarly pursuits.²³ He remained there until his death in 1755.

The key to Mosheim's life as a teacher and scholar was tremendous erudition. He worked in every department of theology and wrote homiletical works, exegetical studies, dogmatics, ethics, practical theology, and history of dogma, showing not merely extent of learning, but a degree of depth and novelty as well.²⁴ This variety of learning, of course, informed

¹⁹ For other instances of this type of patronage, cf. Karl Friedrich August Kahnis, *Der innere Gang des deutschen Protestantismus*, I (Leipzig, 1874), p. 189.

²⁰ Johann Stephan Puetters, *Versuch einer academischen Gelehrten-Geschichte von der Georg Augustus Universitaet zu Goettingen*, I (Goettingen, 1765), p. 20.

²¹ Johann August Christoph von Einem, *Versuch einer vollstaendigen Kirchengeschichte des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig, 1783), p. 234.

²² For his advanced views on matters as academic freedom, the need for adequate equipment, and the obligation of making original contributions to knowledge, cf. Johann Lorenz Mosheim, "De Optima Academia," *Commentationes et Orationes* (Hamburg, 1751), pp. 636f.

²³ The best sources on the founding and early years of the University of Goettingen are the *Akten Cod. Goetting. Ms. hist. litt.* and E. Roessler, *Die Gruendung der Universitaet Goettingen*, Goettingen, 1855, cited in Nathanael Bonwetsch, "Johann Lorenz von Mosheim als Kirchenhistoriker," *Festschrift zur Feier des hundertfuenfzig jaehrigen Bestehens der Koeniglichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Goettingen* (Berlin, 1901), p. 237.

²⁴ Cf., for example, Johann Lorenz Mosheim, *Anweisung erbaulich zu predigen; Erklaerung des Ersten Briefes des heiligen Apostels Pauli an die Gemeinde zu Corinthus; Sittenlehre der Heiligen Schrift; Elementa Theologiae Dogmaticae in academicis quondam praelectionibus proposita et demonstrata*. Adolph Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, I (Freiburg, 1894), p. 26, calling Mosheim the "Erasmus of the 18th century," credited him with attempting to reach a critico-historical position in the matter of the history of dogma.

his studies of church history, which early became his chief interest. After the summer of 1725 he regularly read the church history lectures, and the following year he published his first compendium of church history.²⁵ He translated into German and Latin articles and books of Italian, French, and English historians as well as Greek patristic writings. After 1734 he extended the scope of his studies to include also the church history of the Orient.²⁶

Mosheim's reputation as a church historian, however, rests primarily on two major writings, the *Institutiones historiae ecclesiasticae antiquae et recentioris*, 1755, and the *De rebus Christianorum ante Constantinum Magnum Commentarii*, 1753. The *Institutiones* underwent a steady evolution from a hastily compiled handbook to a comprehensive study based largely on primary sources, published only a few months before Mosheim's death. In 1739 Mosheim published a large volume on the church history of the first century, entitled *Institutiones historiae Christianae maiores*, but he never succeeded in duplicating this effort for the century following. Instead he evolved a plan for a work in which all available knowledge of the early centuries would be presented in a more succinct form. The huge *Commentarii* was the result, still today one of the most comprehensive works on the first three hundred years of the Christian era and considered by some to be the best example of Mosheim's writing.²⁷

August Wilhelm von Schlegel once spoke of the historian as "a prophet looking backward." Today, as historians become increasingly realistic about the achievement and limitations of their work, the scientific method in the absolute sense loses adherents. Granting human freedom and infinite variability, the student must take account of the historian's philosophy in evaluating his writing. Written history is thought about the past informed by historical record; as such, it can-

²⁵ There are adequate sources for a study of Mosheim's writings. He himself in his *Notitia Scriptorum et Dissertationum* lists all his works written to 1731. Those published to 1764 are listed in the 2d edition of the *Institutiones*, pp. 953ff. Some of his essays have been collected into special volumes, *Dissertationum ad historiam ecclesiasticam pertinentium*, two volumes, *Dissertationum ad sanctiores disciplinas pertinentium syntagma*, and the *Commentationes et orationes varii argumenti*.

²⁶ Cf. Johann Lorenz Mosheim, *Historia Tartorum ecclesiastica*, 1741; *Erzaehlung der neuesten chinesischen Kirchengeschichte*, 1748.

²⁷ Nathanael Bonwetsch, *op. cit.*, 261.

not be analyzed in a test tube. Documents alone never make history. They must be arranged and interpreted. Basic to an evaluation of a historian, therefore, is an appreciation of the philosophy which premised his writing.²⁸

Voltaire is reputed to have coined the phrase "philosophy of history," but the idea itself comes from times very ancient. It did not develop from the Hellenic spirit. Neither Greek religion nor Greek philosophy evidenced any real sense of either freedom or progress. Submission to a directionless nemesis was most characteristic of classic antiquity. Three views of history are possible: that history is an atomistic totality of incongruous and chaotic events having no meaning or significance; that history is cyclical, marked by regression equal to progression; and, finally, that history is in a directed movement. The first of these possibilities has always proved unacceptable to a people with the least conception of complex relationships. The second most nearly approximates the position of Hellenism, brilliant but lacking in depth. The origins of the third possible philosophy of history must be found rather in Judaism. The conception found there was that God had initiated the historical process by a uniquely creative act. As Preserver as well as Creator He providentially directed its course toward a new and final age in which redemption, climaxed by judgment, would eventuate. Typical is the Book of Daniel, which in symbolic drama portrayed mankind engaged in a process tending toward a definite goal. Christianity not only grew in this conception, but placed itself consciously in the pattern therein outlined. Schelling has suggested that Christianity is in the highest degree historical and represents a revelation of God in history. This tie between Christianity and history is reflected in no other world religion. Christianity introduced a historical dynamism and an extraordinary force of historical movement making possible a philosophy of history not merely in a religious sense, but in the whole sense of movement and progress, a conception adopted even in secular Marxism.²⁹

²⁸ Cf. Charles A. Beard, "Written History as an Act of Faith," *The American Historical Review*, XXXIV, No. 2, p. 219.

²⁹ Nicolas Berdyaev, *The Meaning of History* (New York, 1936), p. 33. Cf. Shirley Jackson Case, *The Christian Philosophy of History* (Chicago, 1943), pp. 14 ff. William Ralph Inge, *The Idea of Progress* (Oxford, 1920), pp. 5 ff.

The systematizer and classic spokesman for the Christian philosophy of history was St. Augustine, to whom the "verdict of the world was conclusive." Squarely in his tradition stood the Reformers. To them both the four kingdoms of Daniel and Augustine's City of God were real and sure. Melancthon was fond of the sentence *Deus transfert et stabilis regna!*³⁰ To acknowledge this fact was to them the purpose of historical studies, a purpose requiring far more depth, for example, than the practical political aim of a Machiavelli or Guicciardini. This conception of history activated Mosheim's philosophical insight and gave comprehensiveness to his view. In this sense Mosheim was very much a child of the Reformation. He believed that the world was created out of nothing by the infinite power of God, a belief which he expressly divorced from any dependence upon "human philosophies," on the ground that it is unique in being a belief in an actual historical occurrence, not as in the ancient philosophers, a trans-historical abstraction, conceiving matter itself to be but a state either of the world mind or human imagination.³¹ His philosophy was essentially based on the theology of the Reformation. Not only his dogmatic formulations indicate this, but also many of his other non-historical writings.³² Mosheim desired to remain within the framework of the orthodox theological structure.³³ He viewed Luther as the restorer of the true Christian doctrine.³⁴ His beliefs were based on revelation and a Biblical interpretation reassured by his trust in the perspicuity of the Scriptures. Therefore in his *Anweisung erbaulich zu predigen* he constantly inveighed against any allegorical or philosoph-

³⁰ *Corpus Reformatorum*, XII (*Halis Saxonum*, 1844), pp. 779, 870, 992, etc.

³¹ Johann Lorenz Mosheim, "De Creatione Mundi ex Nihilo," *Commentationes et Orationes*, pp. 124, 129, 135.

³² Cf. *Elementa Theologiae Dogmaticae in Academicis quondam praelectionibus proposita et demonstrata*, part III (Nuremberg, 1764), "Oeconomia Salutis seu ratio salutem obtinendi introductio." A very explicit example of his adherence to the accepted interpretations of Lutheranism was his "Cogitationes de Justificatione Abrahami ad illustranda Loca quaedam epistolae d. Pauli ad Romanos," *Commentationes et Orationes*, pp. 74 ff.

³³ Albert Henry Newman's analysis that Mosheim "cared nothing for orthodox Lutheranism" is very much oversimplified. *Op. cit.*, p. 536.

³⁴ Johann Lorenz Mosheim, *Historia Michaelis Serveti* (Helmstedt, 1727), Prooemium: "Illud inprimis tempus, quo vir immortalis memoriae, Martinus Lutherus, religionem integritati suae restituit, luculentissima nobis huius veritatis testimonia exhibet."

ical interpretation. To him theology was an artificial construction of the saving truth, revealed by God, not presented to the Apostles as a corpus or in a systematic rational plan.³⁵ Mosheim left room for his own individual stamp, however. He did not differ from the orthodox theology in definition, but in emphasis.

The direction of Mosheim's theological development was certainly not toward Calvinism. He severely chastised Calvinism for the doctrine of particular grace and the unchangeable decrees of God over man's salvation, even charging that these teachings were directly responsible for the apostasy of men like Thomas Hobbes.³⁶ His translation of John Hales' *Geschichte des Dordrechter Konzils* revealed the same opinion. When Pfaff, the chancellor of Tuebingen, urged a union between Lutherans and Reformed, Mosheim opposed it.³⁷ In the *De concilio Dordraceno*, 1724, he maintained that the Council of Dort made union impossible.³⁸

Mosheim's theological leaning was transitional to a new development rather than to Calvinism. Eighteenth century theology in Germany can be divided into three periods, transitional theology, neology, and rationalism. The first was a period of critical inquiry within the limits of dogma and revelation. The second period gave up the dogma, but held to the revelation. In the final period both were abandoned.³⁹ Of course these periods were not strictly exclusive but overlapped, owing to the great variety among individual thinkers and writers. Mosheim's position may perhaps be best described as that of mild orthodoxy, a form of transitional theology. He proceeded on Leibniz's premise "je n'ai pas l'esprit desapprobateur."⁴⁰ Transitional theology was marked by a new emphasis away from dogma to exegetical and his-

³⁵ Johann Lorenz Mosheim, *Elementa Theologiae Dogmaticae in Academicis quondam praelectionibus proposita et demonstrata*, p. 1.

³⁶ Cf. Johann Lorenz Mosheim's introduction to John Tillotson, *Auserlesene Predigten ueber wichtige Stuecke der goettlichen Lehre* (Helmstedt, 1736).

³⁷ On the position of Pfaff see Revere Franklin Weidner, *Theological Encyclopaedia and Methodology*, I (Chicago, 1898), p. 24.

³⁸ Ferdinand Chr. Baur, *Kirchengeschichte der neueren Zeit*, p. 650.

³⁹ Joh. Ph. Koehler, *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte* (Milwaukee, 1917), pp. 558 ff.

⁴⁰ A typical expression is that found in Mosheim's *Historia Michaelis Serveti, Prooemium*: "Hominum genus bonis malisque semper permixtum fuisse, nemo tam rudis est, qui nesciat."

torical studies. Mosheim figured especially in this latter emphasis.⁴¹ Another element in this *Uebergangstheologie*, which was also a part of Mosheim's approach, was the use of reason in presenting the old dogmatics in an elegant garment.⁴² The tension between the Christian spirit and the new Hellenism was growing and the conflict was evident in Mosheim's thinking.

Rationalism and the Enlightenment had a tremendous effect on historiography. The movement named by Kant the *Aufklaerung* not only reduced interest in the historical by placing emphasis on existing institutions, but changed the whole basis of church history.⁴³ Orthodoxy had used as its measure in evaluating the progress of the Church the fortunes of the correctly believing Christians. Pietism had judged the course of church history on the basis of the distinction between the converted and the unconverted. The emphasis of the *Aufklaerung* was revolutionary. The revealed knowledge of God was compared with the natural knowledge dependent on reason, and Christianity was accepted as the religion best expressing the tenets of reason if it was accepted at all. Dogmatics were suppressed. Moreover, revelation was not limited to one dispensation, but continued at all times. New emphasis was placed on the practical and ethical. And, finally, the restriction of religion within the limits of pure reason required a recasting of the essential content of Christian doctrine. In spite of the defense of church history by Gottlieb Planck, its usefulness was under attack by the apostles of the *Aufklaerung*.⁴⁴ The total effect of rationalism on church history was to accelerate the critical approach and to reduce dependence on dogmatic theology, but at the same time by treating the Christian past as the product of human passion, mean mo-

⁴¹ Horst Stephan, *Geschichte der evangelischen Theologie seit dem deutschen Idealismus* (Berlin, 1938), p. 9.

⁴² Friedrich C. Schlosser, *Weltgeschichte fuer das deutsche Volk*, XIV (Oberhausen, 1873), p. 515. Mosheim would have found impossible an artless presentation like his contemporary Christian Eberhardt Weismann's *Introductio in memorabilia ecclesiastica Historiae Sacrae Novi Testamenti ad iuvandam notitiam regni Dei et Satanae cordisque humani salutarem plana et facili methodo olim consignata*.

⁴³ Marianne Beyer-Froehlich, *Pietismus und Rationalismus* (Leipzig, 1934), p. 13.

⁴⁴ For a brilliant essay on the church history of the *Aufklaerung*, cf. Karl Voelker, *Die Kirchengeschichtsschreibung der Aufklaerung* (Tuebingen, 1921).

tives, and trivial causes it lost a real appreciation for the organic connection and development of the whole. This defect was not really repaired until Neander, under the influence of Schleiermacher, undertook the writing of a more philosophic church history and Ferdinand C. Baur began writing under the influence of Hegel's system.⁴⁵ Because of this tremendous effect of the *Aufklaerung* on church historiography, an examination of Mosheim's relation to it is as necessary as is fixing his theological relation to orthodoxy.

The Enlightenment originated in England, where rationalistic tendencies began to appear in the seventeenth century. The deism of Lord Herbert of Cherbury and the materialism of Hobbes preceded the rationalism of men like John Locke and John Tillotson. The latter was the foremost preacher of his day, an opponent of mysticism and a champion of reason, by which he meant the faculty of direct vision, comparison of the religious propositions with those propositions suggested by reason. The chief value of religion is in supplying divine sanctions for morality. The combination of the rationalist and supernaturalist in Tillotson was typical of his age. The work of Descartes in developing his individual thought system and the voluminous writing of Pierre Bayle introduced the Enlightenment to France. The Enlightenment reached Germany by various paths. Perhaps the intercourse with England through the House of Hanover expedited it.⁴⁶ The Leipzig jurist Christian Thomasius and his patron Samuel Pufendorf of Jena may also have transplanted the ideas of Locke to German soil.⁴⁷ But by far the most important figures in this development were Leibniz and Christian Wolf, who made clearness and reasonableness the sole criteria for truth. Translations of such English writings as Shaftesbury's *Characteristics*, 1738, and Tindal's *Christianity as old as Creation*, 1741, began to appear.⁴⁸ Mosheim was keenly sensitive to the impact of the *Aufklaerung*.

Mosheim knew the English, French, and German litera-

⁴⁵ Arthur Cushman McGiffert, *Protestant Thought Before Kant* (New York, 1922), p. 189.

⁴⁶ Joh. Ph. Koehler, *op. cit.*, p. 552.

⁴⁷ Karl Guden, *Das Jahrhundert der Aufklaerung* (Hannover, 1868), pp. 21 ff.

⁴⁸ Arthur Cushman McGiffert, *op. cit.*, p. 247.

tures of the *Aufklaerung* well. His early writings against Toland, *Vindicae Antiquae Christianorum disciplinae, Adversus Tolandi Nazarenum*, showed his relation to the deistic movement. But his work on Cudworth's *True Intellectual System of the Universe*, 1732, offered him the best opportunity for noting his views in great detail. For deism he had no sympathy whatever. Herbert of Cherbury, while an excellent man, went to extremes in justifying and palliating the opinions and ceremonies of pagan nations, though, Mosheim conceded, he was driven to those extremes by Roman Catholic theologians who cast infamy on pagan religions.⁴⁹ He disagreed with Cudworth's charges of atheism leveled against Hobbes, finding in the *Leviathan* evidences of his belief in a deity with a very ethereal body.⁵⁰ He was careful to remark that "whether this cunning crafty man said this sincerely from his heart or merely to avoid odium, God only knows."⁵¹ Mosheim had read almost all of the Latin and English works of Hobbes and considered his doctrines "wicked and impious" and Hobbes himself a "very bad man" who directed insidious attacks upon the heavenly truth. He found a serious contradiction in Hobbes's system in that Hobbes denied that the truth or falsehood of anything can be proved from the divine perfections, inasmuch as we have no true knowledge of them, and at the same time maintained that the torments of the wicked after death will have an end because that is evident from our notion of the divine mercy.⁵² In his introduction to the German edition of Tillotson's sermons Mosheim gave almost unreserved praise to him as a great evangelical.⁵³ Though Mosheim cited Pierre Bayle often, Descartes' thought seems to have been more challenging to him. He took what was then considered a moderate view of Descartes — that he had some sort of religion, but held opinions not favorable to piety.⁵⁴ He felt that viewing wisdom and design in creation was irreconcilable with an opinion that God was withdrawn from the government of the world. He approved of Robert Boyle's *De Causis Finalibus*,

⁴⁹ Ralph Cudworth, *The True Intellectual System of the Universe*, II (London, 1845), p. 78, note 8. Notes by Mosheim.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, II, p. 510, note 3.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, II, p. 562, note 12.

⁵² *Ibid.*, I, p. 103, note 3.

⁵³ Johann Tillotson, *p. cit.*, *Vorrede*.

⁵⁴ Ralph Cudworth, *op. cit.*, I, p. 276, note 6.

in which Boyle opposed Descartes. He found, as had Pierre Gassendi, that the Cartesian proof for existence was reasoning in a circle, on the grounds that the notion of God, although innate and apparently evident to the person, might be fallacious and visionary.⁵⁵ Mosheim charitably concluded that Descartes had rejected final causes from his physics not through any innate depravity of mind or impiety toward God, but principally through his fondness for his own philosophy.⁵⁶

In Germany the first important conflict over rationalism developed after 1723.⁵⁷ In 1719, Christian Wolf, following in the steps of Leibniz, published his *Rational Thoughts on God, the World, and the Soul*, with the aim of making philosophic truth as self-evident as the mathematical. Therefore the doctrines of Christianity would be either capable of demonstration or not worthy of belief. He thought the first of these alternatives possible. Additional proofs from experience were merely contingent and confirmatory. He definitely broke with church doctrine in viewing man as progressing independently toward a larger completeness.⁵⁸ He himself expressed his dependence on Locke, whose major premises he shared.⁵⁹

Mosheim had the greatest admiration for Leibniz, praising the genius of that "greatest of eclectics."⁶⁰ He said of Wolf: "Wolf ist mein guter Freund, ob ich gleich, welches er selbst weisz, kein Wolffianer bin."⁶¹ These words strikingly illustrate his actual relationship to the German Enlightenment. While his historical interests tended to detract from his dogmatic interests and from any sympathy with the scientific and ethical narrowness of the Pietists, they also separated him from the hypercritical and non-historical tendency of rationalism. Nevertheless, Mosheim may be identified with the group of

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, II, p. 591, note 2. III, p. 32, note 5. This deduction received the praise of Siegmund Baumgarten, *Untersuchung Theologischer Streitigkeiten*, I (Halle, 1762), p. 426.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, II, p. 616, note 3.

⁵⁷ For an account of the position of the leading German theologians in this controversy, cf. K. R. Hagenbach, *A Textbook of the History of Doctrines*, I (New York, 1861), pp. 376 ff.

⁵⁸ On the theology of the Enlightenment, cf. Karl Friedrich August Kahnis, *op. cit.*, pp. 69 ff.

⁵⁹ Christian Wolf, *Philosophia Practica Universalis Methodo Scientifica pertractata* (Halle, 1744), *Praefatio*.

⁶⁰ *Institutiones*, pp. 753, 821, 908.

⁶¹ Johann August Christoph von Einem, *op. cit.*, p. 238.

theologians in that day moving in the direction which the Enlightenment eventually took.⁶²

Mosheim's theological position and personal philosophy of history was of tremendous significance for his conception and evaluation of the factors in historical development. He was no real theoretician, and nowhere did he give a really extensive presentation of his philosophy of historical writing. He was no originator of great new insights into historical processes. His discussion of material organization and experiments in new division of historical narrative really were fundamentally more a matter of method than of theory. To define the scope and essential content of a limited discipline like church history had not been undertaken by his predecessors. The Centurians had presented their conception of the purposes of their writing but had not elaborated upon the reason for it. In comparison with them it might be said that Mosheim did make at least a beginning in defining the nature and purpose of the historian's task, though, as said, his actual achievement was modest.⁶³

His conception of the nature and task of church history may best be learned from the definition which he gives in his *Institutiones*, p. 3:

The Ecclesiastical History of the New Dispensation is a clear and faithful narrative of the external condition, and of the internal state and transactions, of that body of men who have borne the name of Christians; and in which events are so traced to their causes that the providence of God may be seen in the establishment and preservation of the church and the reader's piety, no less than his intelligence, be advanced by the perusal.

The best form of such a history seems to be that which considers the whole body of Christians as constituting a so-

⁶² Franz von Wegele, *Geschichte der Deutschen Historiographie seit dem Auftreten des Humanismus* (Muenchen, 1885), p. 740.

⁶³ One of the earliest studies of Mosheim's philosophy of historical writing was that of F. Christian Baur in *Die Epochen der kirchlichen Geschichtsschreibung* (Tuebingen, 1852). Franz von Wegele, *op. cit.*, 1885, was heavily dependent on Baur and added little that is constructive. More recently Nathanael Bonwetsch contributed an article, "Johann Lorenz von Mosheim als Kirchenhistoriker," to the *Festschrift zur Feier des hundertfuenfzigjaehrigen Bestehens der Koeniglichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Goettingen* (Berlin, 1901), in which he made his analysis more directly on Mosheim's writing than on Mosheim's explanations of that writing. The most complete article of this nature is that of Karl Heussi, "Die Kirchengeschichtsschreibung Johann Lorenz von Mosheims" in the *Geschichtliche Untersuchungen* (Gotha, 1904), edited by Karl Lamprecht.

ciety or community, subjected to lawful authority and governed by certain laws and institutions. To such a community many external events must happen, which will be favorable to its interests or adverse to them: and, since nothing human is stable and uniform, many things will occur in the bosom of such community tending to change its character. Hence its history may very suitably be divided into its external and its internal history. In this manner the history of the Christian community, in order to embrace all the details and promote the greatest usefulness, should be divided.

This definition is hardly that of an original thinker. It is rather that of a man seeking a practical working concept. While it can easily be defended as consistent with the Orthodox theology, since it could be considered as *ecclesia visibilis*, in which were included the wrong believing as well as the correct believing members, the definition does have a secular ring to it. By identifying the Church as a *coetus hominum*, Mosheim did externalize the concept of the Church and deprived it of the specific meaning and connotation understood by his predecessors. If to them the Church was the veritable Kingdom of God in opposition to the kingdom of the devil, to him it was an association of humans. If to them the heretics were those who erred against the doctrine, to him they were disturbers of the peace. Of course, these differences were not absolute, but in general they represented the trend or emphasis of Mosheim's thinking. The analogy with the State is obvious. It was a useful device for simplifying the management of materials. The Church had its rulers, laws, wars, body of citizens, disturbers of the peace, just as the State. In spite of the detailed care given to doctrine and spiritual development in the sections of his works devoted to "internal history," the Church nevertheless remained essentially a body of people.

While this externalized conception of the Church lacked the dynamic element present in the histories of his predecessors, it served as the main thread of continuity in Mosheim's history. By the way in which he traced the relationship of the Church to the religious and cultural circumstances in which the Church existed and found the interaction between them, he demonstrated an appreciation of historical development.⁶⁴ He appreciated the significance of the whole milieu

⁶⁴ To say that he did not conceive of these changes as historical development, but possibly only as a matter of the "adverse events of the church" which happened to be cumulative over an extended period (Karl

for church history. The individual fact was dependent in part on the spirit of the times, the *Zeitbewusstsein*. Striking examples of this insight were the essays on world conditions at the time of Christ and again at the time of Luther.⁶⁵ Moreover, his rather consistent demonstration of the relationship of church history to political history is a further indication of his insight into factors of historical development.

His major failing in this respect was in overemphasizing the personal elements at the expense of the whole causal nexus.⁶⁶ This shortcoming was due to the influence of the *Aufklaerung* upon his thought, with its stress on the significance of personal motivation in explaining any occurrence. He found, for example, that the adoption of pageantry in the Church was due to the perverseness of mankind, which delights more in pomp and splendor than in true devotion. Again, in discussing the origins of Gnosticism, Manichaeism, or his conception of the general Oriental philosophy, he always referred to the originator, or parent, who himself contrived the system.⁶⁷ Never, however, did he go so far as Plutarch, Carlyle, Emerson, or similar devotees of the personal factor in history.

In spite of these limitations, Mosheim did contribute to an advance toward genetic history. The difficulty of comprehending the full meaning of the fact of continuity has always been one of the major difficulties of historiography. The pluralistic phenomena of history are so varied and often seemingly so inconsistent, a maze of promiscuous events, as

Heussi, "Die Kirchengeschichtsschreibung Johann Lorenz Mosheims," in Karl Lamprecht, *Geschichtliche Untersuchungen*, p. 29) seems rather a tendentious judgment in view of the fact that Mosheim never expressed himself on this phase of historical writing in any detail. The essential thing is that he actually presented changes as following upon an accumulation of factors. That is a presentation of development, whether it is done inadvertently or with full awareness.

⁶⁵ *Commentarii*, p. 1: Prolegomena de Statu orbis terrarum, quum nasceretur Christus; p. 564: Status rei Christianae ante Coeptam Reformationem.

⁶⁶ *Institutiones*, p. 6: "In exploring the causes of events, besides access to ancient testimony and the history of the times, a good knowledge of human nature is requisite. The historian who understands the human character, the propensities and powers, the passions and weaknesses of man, will readily discover the causes of many things attempted or done in former times."

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 37: "Sic enim parens eius sine controversia ratiocinabatur . . ."; p. 119, *re* Manes: "exuberantis vero ingenii et, quod valde verisimile est, emotae mentis et fanaticus"; *Commentarii*, pp. 26 f.: "eius auctor. . ."

to defy a genetic approach.⁶⁸ Yet that is the historian's task. Mosheim's predecessors in church history had done poorly in this respect. The historians of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation had been didactic with emphasis on biography and dogma. The Polyhistorians of the seventeenth century had, like Aristotle, made history a matter of detail, not of the universal or necessary. Mosheim had attacked them mercilessly. In 1717 he wrote his "*Cogitationes de studio litterario*," in which he inveighed against the fruitless compilation of materials and masses of particulars without understanding the real relationship of the whole.⁶⁹ He determined to do better. He did have a real interest in the larger historical connections, although he was unable to articulate them in a new terminology. Like most pioneers, he lacked tools for ready generalization and classification. Larger conceptual terms, such as Renaissance, Reformation, Protestantism, Jesuitism, and Catholicism, did not occur to him. His effort to subordinate fact and detail to larger conceptions, though clumsily expressed, and to look for more extensive interrelationships between historical events owed its inspiration to another element in Mosheim's view of history. His Christian understanding of history would, of course, lead him to view history as a whole rather than as a meaningless mass of occurrences. But his effort to trace cause and effect relationships in history was derived more immediately from his conviction that history must serve a pragmatic purpose, must serve to "enlighten" and not just satisfy a natural curiosity about the past.

Pragmatic history, of course, did not originate with Mosheim. In classic times, Thucydides, Polybius, and Tacitus had been extreme examples of historians who viewed their task in this light. Bernheim has observed that this type of history has commonly appeared whenever a people of culture became self-conscious and subjective.⁷⁰ This keen analysis offers an explanation for the occurrence of this conception of history in Humanism and still more extremely in the historiography of the Enlightenment. Pragmatic history was renewed, after centuries of medieval collectivism followed by

⁶⁸ Ernest Bernheim, *Einleitung in die Geschichtswissenschaft* (Berlin, 1920), pp. 7 ff.

⁶⁹ *Commentationes et Orationes varii Argumenti*, pp. 110 f.

⁷⁰ Ernest Bernheim, *op. cit.*, pp. 7 ff.

an increase in individualism, in the French and Italian memoirs and chronicles. In Germany "pragmatic" had first been applied to political history by Reiner Reineccius before the time of the Thirty Years' War.

Church history stood in an unusual relationship to pragmatic history in post-Reformation days. For Protestant historiography the expressions of Luther were basic and to him the pedagogical was the most important part of history.⁷¹ It was not therefore the introduction of teaching purposes to history which won for Mosheim the distinction of having been the first to apply the pragmatic method of church history. Rather it was his orientation toward a new emphasis to which the Church of the Reformation had previously been hostile, namely, a devotion to morality divorced for all practical purposes from the broader aspects of the Christian faith.⁷² Mosheim attributed the relatively few uses of church history as compared with secular history to its insufficient pragmatic development. Church history, indeed, gave full accounts of events, errors, origins of dogma and rites; it did not show the interrelation of changes with their results, the only way in which church history could serve as a teacher. Church history should serve theologians as political history served statesmen.⁷³

Therefore Mosheim stressed the true presentation of events in their cause and effect relation. "In treating of both the external and the internal history of the church, the writer who would be useful must trace events to their causes; that is, he must tell us not only what happened, but likewise how and why."⁷⁴ Such an aim necessitated subordinating details. The story of the growth of the Church would *eo ipso* tend to confirm the faith of the Christian, since it demonstrated a prosperous development from small beginnings.⁷⁵ Mosheim consistently, even while applying a kind of philosophical pragmatism which traced the genesis of events from a natural

⁷¹ Walter Nigg, *Die Kirchengeschichtsschreibung. Grundzuege ihrer historischen Entwicklung* (Muenchen, 1934), p. 42.

⁷² Cf. Benedetto Croce, *History, Its Theory and Practice* (New York, 1921), p. 248.

⁷³ Johann Lorenz Mosheim, *Dissertationum ad Historiam Ecclesiasticam Pertinentium*, I (Altonaviae et Flensburgi, 1743), pp. 89 f.

⁷⁴ *Institutiones*, p. 6.

⁷⁵ Johann Lorenz Mosheim, *Dissertationum ad Historiam Ecclesiasticam Pertinentium*, I, p. 10.

standpoint, with what might be called a theological pragmatism, strove to recognize the agency of God working toward a further end. Particularly in the moderation with which he applied this method, Mosheim was far superior to the so-called Pragmatic School of church historians of the later eighteenth century. This "school," which considered Mosheim as its founder, composed of such historians as Johann Schroeckh, Ludwig Spittler the Voltairean, Gottlieb Planck of Goettingen, and Heinrich Henke of Helmstedt, went far beyond Mosheim in applying church history to pragmatic ends, particularly the ends of morality and ethics.

The abuse to which pragmatic history lent itself at the hands of the Pragmatic School emphasized the dilemma which Mosheim also faced. Either it had to be assumed that history of itself is of such a nature that an impartial presentation will serve pragmatic ends, or history must be presented so as to bring out the lessons more obviously even at the sacrifice of objectivity. Of these two possibilities Mosheim chose the former. He was sure that history did substantiate his dogmatic or philosophic position and was not really aware of the full implications which the growing historical relativism of the Enlightenment had with respect to those very pragmatic ends which he considered the desirable purposes of historical studies. Therefore it was possible for him to attempt with complete assurance the writing of both pragmatic and objective history. Indeed he constantly stressed the need for complete impartiality.⁷⁶ In 1727 he wrote the *Historia Michaelis Serveti*, a specific attempt at impartiality on a highly controversial issue. In 1746 he wrote his *Versuch einer unpartheiischen und gruendlichen Ketzergeschichte*, followed two years later by the *Anderweitiger Versuch einer vollstaendigen und unpartheiischen Ketzergeschichte*. He led the way from polemics and apologetics to the discipline of objective historical writing.

The effort to achieve objectivity led Mosheim to a thorough application of source criticism to documentary ma-


⁷⁶ *Institutiones*, p. 835: "Si, quod omnes fatentur, Historici primum hoc munus est, ne quam vel gratiae, vel simultatis suspicionem excitet, hac arte nemo minus ad Historiam scribendam aptus fuit"; *Commentarii, Praefatio*, p. 1: "animadverteram, animo repetebam, esse in Historia rerum Christianarum haud pauca aut prorsus omissa, aut male narrando depravata, aut denique perperam sive negligentia, sive partium studio sive inсто maiori alienae diligentiae fiducia intellecta."

terials. It is method, as Ernst Bernheim has pointed out, not genius or erudition, that makes the historian.⁷⁷ And one of the basic operations in historical method is the selection and criticism of sources. From the days of Hegesippus on, very few church historians, however bad the record of the chroniclers, have failed entirely to appreciate this. Source criticism received new momentum through the Reformation and the subsequent controversies over the historic nature of Christianity. The impact of this new concern for historicity was evident particularly in the work of Melancthon, who in turn influenced the whole subsequent development of Protestant historiography. In Mosheim's own day, Leibniz had re-emphasized the necessity of basing history on original sources. In fact, he had even organized an association in 1670 to encourage the systematic collection of source materials. But no thorough application of source criticism had ever been made to the entire range of church history. Mosheim undertook that stupendous task. The heir of the Protestant tradition of insistence on true historical foundations and inspired to use a more scientific method by the intellectual stimulation of the Enlightenment, Mosheim attempted to apply the canons of criticism as he knew them to the complete story of the Church. Small wonder that his histories dominated the field for a century after they first appeared.

A proper assessment of history requires a sound study of the historian, particularly of one who does not use entirely the *sic narravere Patres* as his rule. An understanding of Johann Lorenz Mosheim's philosophy of history and place in the theology of the eighteenth century is most helpful in evaluating his conception of the nature and task of church history. History is indeed, as Cicero put it, "the witness of the times," of the times in which it is written as well as of the times about which it is written.

Columbia, Mo.

⁷⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 162: "Geist ohne Methode schaedigt die Wissenschaft nicht minder als Methode ohne Geist."



The Effect of the Trend Toward Religious Schools on Public Schools

By CLARENCE PETERS

Before investigating the topic before us, it may be well for us to inquire into the reason why some churches maintain their own schools. The reason is not that they do not appreciate the public school or the advantages which these tax-supported schools have brought to the people of America.

Churches maintain full-time religious schools at considerable expense because they recognize the *unitary* nature of education. They are convinced that it is pedagogically unsound to exclude religious instruction from the child's schooling and to relegate it to after-school hours or Sunday morning. In their view a child cannot receive a complete education in a school from which religion has been excluded. They believe that to keep religion out of the child's schooling is to give him the impression that religion is unimportant and not one of the basic values in his education. The general lack of interest among Americans in the Church is due in no small measure to the fact that churches have relinquished their obligation to provide adequate, daily religious instruction and to the silence which the public school has been forced to observe with respect to religion.¹

Lutherans cannot divorce the sacred from the secular in education. As they see it, religion, or the fear and love of God, supplies the only adequate motivation for the development of talents and the dedication of one's life to the service of God and man. Thus religion undergirds the whole of life. The Christian faith centers the child's life in God and in Christ and gives religious motivation to the individual's thinking and behavior in all phases of life.

Excellent as are the public schools in many respects, they cannot give this motivation. For some of us, then, there seems to be no alternative but to establish our own schools, since we

¹ I am here not saying that religion should or should not be taught in the public schools, but refer only to the results of the silence with respect to religion in the public schools.

desire for our children an education that is God-centered, Christ-centered, and Bible centered. Christian parents willingly pay taxes for the support of the public schools and make financial sacrifices for the maintenance of their own schools, because they know they are responsible to God for the transmission of the Christian faith to their children and for training them in the fear of God, or holy and righteous living. God's Word again and again gives this instruction to parents: "These words, which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart, and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children." Deut. 6:6-7. "The father to the children shall make known Thy truth." Is. 38:19. "Train up a child in the way he should go." Prov. 22:6. "Ye fathers . . . bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." Eph. 6:4. God's instruction to children to obey, honor, hearken unto, despise not, be subject to, and others, involve the responsibility of the parents who are to see to it that the children are thus instructed. They are in conscience bound to select for their children what in their judgment is the best type of school.

It has sometimes been asserted that non-public schools are un-American, but this assertion is contrary to the history of religion and education in the United States. The early schools were religious schools. As the public school system developed, most of the denominations closed their schools with the understanding that religion and the Bible would not be barred from these tax-supported schools. The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod has maintained its own elementary schools since it was founded in 1847, because of the unitary concept of education which is basic in the Lutheran philosophy of education. Meanwhile the process of removing God from instruction has gone forward in our public school system. The absence of religious instruction has caused a breakdown in morals and ethics, and this has caused many Protestants seriously to doubt whether a system of education which leaves out God is adequate. Some groups have maintained a system of religious schools for many years, while others have but recently established such schools, or are planning to do so.

A glance at statistics reveals that there has been an increase in the number of schools and in the enrollment of these schools during the past decade.

STATISTICS OF RELIGIOUS ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS IN THE UNITED STATES

<i>Religious Schools</i>	Enrollment 1937	Enrollment 1947
Roman Catholic	2,086,071 pupils	2,830,065 pupils ² (8,165 schools)
Lutheran	74,951 pupils (1,195 schools)	105,965 pupils ³ (1,600 schools)
Seventh-Day Adventist	?	26,619 pupils ⁴ (898 schools)
Reformed persuasion	13,747 pupils (85 schools)	21,175 pupils ⁵ (120 schools)
Mennonite	125 pupils (4 schools)	2,106 pupils ⁶ (35 schools)
Baptist (Los Angeles area) ---	85 pupils (1 school) (for 1946)	250 pupils ⁷ (3 schools) 1948: 513 pupils (6 schools)

It is apparent from these statistics that during the last ten years there has been an increase in religious schools and in attendance at these schools.

² The information was gathered by Rev. James E. Hofflich, Superintendent of Schools of the Archdiocese of St. Louis, Mo., 3810 Lindell Blvd, St. Louis 8, Mo.

³ The figures for Lutheran schools include elementary schools only. The information is gathered from the *Statistical Yearbook*, 1947, of The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, St. Louis 18, Mo. Edited by Rev. Armin Schroeder. The figures represent the enrollment in the schools of The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, Wisconsin Synod, Slovak Synod, Norwegian Synod, Negro schools, Finnish National Church, U.S., American Lutheran Church. Information concerning the A. L. C. schools was furnished by Mr. D. A. Vetter, 57 E. Main St., Columbus 15, Ohio.

⁴ The figures for the Seventh-Day Adventists were obtained from their Washington, D.C., office by the Public Relations Department, The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, for the office of the Board for Parish Education, The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, St. Louis, Mo. These figures are for the United States and Canada.

⁵ The information concerning the enrollment of the schools of Reformed persuasion is furnished by Mr. Mark Fakkema, Educational Director of the National Association of Christian Schools, 542 S. Dearborn St., Chicago 5, Ill. Three boarding schools of secondary level are not included.

⁶ The Mennonite Board of Education, Mr. C. F. Yake, chairman, Christian Day School Council, Scottdale, Pa., was unable to supply information on the exact enrollment. The figures quoted are those of Mr. Mark Fakkema in a paper on "Survey of Private Schools in the United States."

⁷ Information concerning the Baptist Schools in the Los Angeles area was given by Mr. C. Rowan Lunsford, 354 S. Spring St., Los Angeles 13, Calif.

The *Statistical Circular* of the Federal Security Agency, No. 241, May, 1948, states: "Enrollments and the number of teachers in private and parochial elementary and secondary schools are increasing more rapidly than in public schools. Between 1939—40 and 1945—46 private school enrollments increased 8.2 per cent, while during the same period public school enrollments decreased 8.4 per cent."

We are now ready to deal objectively with the topic "The Effect of the Trend Toward Religious Schools on Public Schools." Or to state it in another way: "The effect of the growth of religious schools on public schools." We shall first consider certain objections which some make against religious schools. Then we shall consider possible disadvantages, and finally advantages or benefits.

OBJECTIONS RAISED AGAINST RELIGIOUS SCHOOLS AND A REPLY

1. There are those who believe religious schools will interfere with, and even prevent, the attainment of the democratic ideal. In the opinion of these people all the youth of the nation should attend the one great educational institution of the State that they may learn to live together democratically. They view the growth of religious schools with apprehension. A group of progressive educators has expressed the fear that if non-public schools "should become so numerous or so permanent as to constitute an institutionalized rival to the common public schools," they will be "a threat to the democratic process."⁸ This criticism is predicated on the assumption that only the public schools are qualified to teach and to train for the democratic way of life. We believe that religiously motivated schools, which teach loyalty to our form of government and to the democratic ideal, are at least as well qualified for the task as are the schools which have no strictly religious motivation. People who are taught to know the true God, who are taught to know and to love and to obey His Word, who are taught to love and to respect their fellow men and to be helpful to them, who are taught to respect and to obey their government, are not the people who will be a threat to the democratic way of life. (Romans 13.)

⁸ John S. Brubacher and Others, *The Public Schools and Spiritual Values*, pp. 6, 16.

Furthermore, it should be remembered that the strength of a nation does not necessarily lie in uniformity of school attendance, but the strength of a democratic nation is in the inculcation of the truths of God which are basic for the ideals of democratic living. Such instruction is a vital force in the lives of the pupils. Once this is understood, it is clear that the determining factor in preparing for democratic living is not to be found in school attendance, but in instructional and curricular content. This is decidedly strengthened when it is based on Christianity, from which stems democratic living. Diversity in a democracy is one of its strong characteristics. There must be uniformity in fundamentals, and only if these fundamentals are absent, can the charge be raised that schools are failing to attain the democratic ideal. And these fundamental principles are contained in the revealed religion of God.

When religion is taught only in the church and not in the school and the home, it can hardly be expected that the child will have an integrated and properly balanced view of religion in its life. Rather, the child is very apt to relegate religion to a spot on Sunday morning and may not regard religion as the dominating and motivating power of its life. Religion is thus divorced from the school day and the daily studies. This is one way of creating a split personality, and home, school, and church may become entirely separate areas for the child and may be unrelated to each other in its thinking.

2. Closely associated with this objection is a second one to the effect that religious schools will create class-consciousness. If this is the result of religious schools, there should be some evidence of it in religious schools that have been in existence for fifty or seventy-five years. We have been unable to find any evidence that the elementary schools of The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod have created class-consciousness. There is no psychological or sociological principle that requires people of all types and races to associate on intimate terms such as the school provides in order to get rid of their prejudices and live together in democratic unity. Many Lutheran congregations are cosmopolitan in character, the schools likewise. These adults and children of various nationalities get along well together because the Christian faith begets a community that transcends all boundaries of race or class, even as the Apostle says: "Ye are all one in Christ Jesus" (Gal.

3:28). The motivation for community spirit and life is oriented in a common faith in a common God, and that is much stronger than the appeal solely on moral and utilitarian grounds. We might observe also that religious schools "isolate" pupils only temporarily. Most of the graduates will attend the public high schools and there mingle with pupils of every nationality and religious faith represented. I do not know a single instance in which graduates of Lutheran schools have proved to be un-co-operative or clannish. On the other hand, scores of testimonials commending the faithfulness and good behavior of our graduates could be collected from high school administrators and teachers.

3. A somewhat more general objection is that the religious school movement, if it continues to grow, will undermine the public school system. Those who raise this objection perhaps believe that as religious schools multiply, the public school will lose its privileged position and will have to struggle to survive. This objection has weight only on the assumption that sooner or later the churches will demand and receive tax moneys, in which case indeed the public school might be weakened. Lutherans, generally speaking, do not favor the use of tax moneys for the support of the instructional program of religious schools.⁹ As matters stand today, the Roman Catholic Church has been in a position to build a vast system of parochial schools, yet fifty per cent of Roman Catholic children are in the public school. The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod is one hundred years old, yet only thirty per cent of its children are in the religious school. If the day should come when all the churches of America would have schools of their own, there would still be seventy or eighty million people, or half of the population of the United States, whose children would attend the public school. Moreover, the majority of graduates from religious schools would attend the public high school.

4. A fourth objection is that religious schools cannot adequately prepare the children for American citizenship. The facts disprove this. I can speak at least for the Lutheran schools. Thousands of Americans are graduates of Lutheran

⁹ Cf. *Proceedings of the Saginaw Convention*, June, 1944, pp. 132 to 134.

schools, and on the whole they rate high as American citizens. Incidence of crime among them is very low. Children who attend Christian schools are taught to respect and to obey their superiors, parents, teachers, the government, to order their lives according to the Ten Commandments, to develop their talents and to devote them to the service of God and man. They are given the strongest possible motivation for good citizenship. (Rom. 13:1-4.)

POSSIBLE DIFFICULTIES

Having shown that the objections that have been raised against religious schools are untenable, I shall frankly state that the multiplication of such schools may create problems. First, the opening of a religious school in a given district may make it difficult for the local school authorities to appraise the facilities that will be required for the public school in the same district. Secondly, there may be a loss of revenue to small schools where State funds supply a considerable share of the moneys needed for school maintenance. The situation may be particularly acute where the appropriation of funds is based on an average daily attendance at the public school. Thirdly, it may be necessary in some cases to retain small public schools in localities where small religious schools provide duplicate facilities; e. g.: a community of one hundred children in which there are small Protestant and Roman Catholic religious schools and a small public school. There may be other difficulties, but they are not too serious, and in all likelihood none of them will be insurmountable, even as the ones listed are not.

BENEFITS TO THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS FROM THE GROWTH OF THE RELIGIOUS SCHOOL MOVEMENT

I shall now mention some of the benefits which will result to the public schools from the growth of the religious school movement.

1. Parallel school systems are a safeguard against monopoly and corruption in education. We know that whatever advantages monopoly may have, it also has some bad and even dangerous features. This is true also of monopoly in education. American educators have been critical of rigid and formal systems of education, such as that of France. They

consider diversity in our American public school system one of its merits. All things being equal, diversity makes for strength and progress. It may also forestall developments of an unsound or dangerous nature. One or more systems of non-public schools, operating side by side with the public school, may safeguard the schools of the country from being carried in the direction of Communism or some other subversive movement.¹⁰ The danger of totalitarianism in one form or another is not nearly as great in a country like ours, where monopoly in education is frowned upon. It is a well-known fact that a nation's thinking and future are shaped by the schools. A monopolistic system could bring about a change from one form of government to another in a single generation.

2. Religious schools contribute to a higher community morality, and this is certainly of benefit to the public schools. Although the government wields the sword and ultimately appeals to force, yet it depends on the consent and the good will of the people to maintain order and peace. Apart from religious faith, people may obey the laws because reason dictates that a man promotes his own happiness and that of others by submitting to the restraints of the law. The catalog of crime, however, shows that those whose religious training is neglected may have very little respect for the law. On the other hand, children attending Christian schools have the principles of the Moral Law inscribed in their hearts. They are trained not only to refrain from murder and robbery and other sins prohibited by the divine Law, but also to practice love, kindness, justice, compassion, and other virtues commanded in the Law. The motivation given in a Lutheran school is the fear and love of God. The pupils are taught that Jesus Christ, the Son of God and Mary's Son, gave His life and shed His blood to redeem them and all sinful mankind and that they ought to live their lives in gratitude to their Savior. Children who receive religious instruction and training will help to maintain the high moral standard which acts as a restraint on the wicked members of society. Public school leaders have stated that our teachers have a distinct advantage over public school teachers in that they can give the children

¹⁰ *Communism and Education*, prepared and released by Committee on un-American Activities, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

a strong religious motivation for moral behavior, whereas the public school teacher may appeal only to reason and conscience. Any fair American citizen will speak with favor of religious schools which help to maintain the moral standard of a community.

3. Religious schools and public schools are mutually helpful in maintaining a high scholastic standard. Cases are on record where public school superintendents have pointed to certain Lutheran schools as examples to the teachers in their districts. The religious schools have thus stimulated public school teachers to set high goals for themselves. On the other hand, religious schools have benefited immeasurably by the immense amount of experimental and research work done in the framework of the public school. Thus the religious and private schools have prompted public school leaders to serious self-criticism, and the public schools have prompted teachers in religious schools to work toward the achievement of the same high standards envisioned by public school leaders.

This fact is pointedly set forth by Alvin W. Johnson and Frank H. Yost in their recent book *Separation of Church and State*:

One of the great values of private schools lies in their differences. State institutions must necessarily be of a somewhat similar pattern. In order to maintain our present standing and, above all, to develop, we must have both individuals and institutions that have the courage of their convictions and that dare to be different. This has been true of the private schools. From these schools have come many of the leaders in educational reform and many of our greatest statesmen. It can hardly be said that these institutions have been a detriment; rather they have been an asset.

It may well be summed up in the words of P. P. Claxton, former United States commissioner of education:

"We believe in the public school system. It is the salvation of our democracy; but the private schools and colleges have been the salvation of the public schools. These private institutions have their place in our educational system. They prevent it from becoming autocratic and arbitrary, and encourage its growth along new lines.

"Some have contended that our public educational system must set the standards for the moral, social, and mental development and training of our youth. That, of course, is the Spartan theory of education. That theory has been combated by our American courts. The laws pertaining to education and school rules and regulations must be observed, but the school, whether it be public or private, is not the sole factor in the development of the child's character. It is simply an aid, though a valuable one,

to be sure, to the desired end. The parents are the responsible factors, and they delegate this primary responsibility to no one; only when they fail, may the state interfere.

"The American courts have at all times protected and perpetuated the right which guarantees to everyone the freedom to worship or not to worship God in the manner he desires, so long as he does not imperil the public safety and morals. The Nebraska German language case and the Oregon school case both sustain this position."¹¹

4. Religious schools have been a benefit to the public schools in the matter of providing facilities and also relief from overcrowding. Despite the widespread and erroneous view to the contrary, religious schools are engaged in general education just as the public schools are. They frequently use the same textbooks, they maintain similar standards, they are subject to a degree of supervision, and yet they give thousands of American children a general education at no cost to the public. They certainly serve the public welfare. As a matter of fact, these schools greatly lighten the burden of taxation. Opponents of Christian schools ought to appreciate the fact that religious elementary schools and high schools, supported by the Christians through freewill offerings, are contributing to the general welfare and morality of the nation. Because of the existence of these schools the overcrowded conditions in the public schools are less acute than they might be.

In conclusion, Lutherans and others maintain their own schools because they want their children to get a complete education, that is, an education that gives the children religious motivation for moral behavior. After devoting much study to this matter, religious educators cannot see any threat to our public school system in the religious school movement. While the multiplication of Christian elementary schools and high schools may create a number of difficulties, none of these will be insurmountable. On the other hand, the existence of one or more parallel school systems alongside the public school system has thus far been beneficial to the public school, and there is no reason to believe that the increase in the number of religious schools will alter this relationship of mutual helpfulness. Objections to a system of religious schools are, it seems to me, based on misapprehensions or speculations and

¹¹ Alvin W. Johnson and Frank H. Yost, *Separation of Church and State*, p. 140.

not on actual facts. In the United States, parents have a legal right to enroll their children in the school of their choice. As good Americans we rid ourselves of the fear that the religious school movement will harm our great public school system.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- John S. Brubacher and Others, *The Public Schools and Spiritual Values*. Harper and Brothers, New York, 1944. \$2.50. Seventh Yearbook of the John Dewey Society.
- Walter H. Beck, *Lutheran Elementary Schools in the United States*. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo., 1939.
- W. S. Fleming, *God in Our Public Schools*. The National Reform Association, 209 Ninth St., Pittsburgh, Pa., 1942.
- Isaac Doughton, *Modern Public Education*. Its Philosophy and Background. D. Appleton-Century Company, New York, 1935.
- Evarts B. Greene, *Church and State*. National Foundation Press, 143 N. Meridian St., Indianapolis 4, Ind., 1947.
- Alvin W. Johnson and Frank H. Yost, *Separation of Church and State*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Arthur L. Miller, *Why Lutheran Elementary Schools?* Board for Parish Education, Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo., 1948.
- Parish Education*, the official publication of the Board for Parish Education, The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. Issue of November, 1948. Arthur L. Miller, Editor.
- The Sunday School Times*, Editorial by J. Oliver Buswell, Jr., issue of Feb. 14, 1948, page 135. 325 N. 13th St., Philadelphia 5, Pa.
- Weekday Church School Bulletin*. Published by Scripture Press, 434 S. Wabash St., Chicago 5, Ill. Issue of January, 1949, Vol. I, No. 8. Edited by Grace Krummel Hardman.
- Four Reasons Why Christian Parents Prefer the Lutheran Elementary School for Their Children. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Missouri.
- Proceedings of the Fortieth Regular Convention of the Ev. Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States*, Chicago, Ill., July 20—29, 1947. Printed by Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. Cf. Report of the Board for Parish Education, pp. 282—292.
- Proceedings of the Thirty-Ninth Regular Convention of the Ev. Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States*, Saginaw, Mich., June 21—29, 1944. Printed by Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. Cf. Report of the Board for Parish Education, pp. 131—134.
- Armin Schroeder, *Statistical Yearbook*, The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, 1947. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo., 1948.

NOTE: This paper was delivered at the annual meeting of the Weekday Religious Education Section of the International Council of Religious Education at the Deshler-Wallick Hotel, Columbus, Ohio, Feb. 9, 1949, at the invitation of the Weekday Section.

Another paper on the same topic was delivered at this meeting by Mr. C. W. Manwiller, chairman of the Department of Research and Curriculum, Pittsburgh, Pa., Public Schools.

His position was that the religious school

- 1) has a tendency to divide public education as to purpose and content;
- 2) will weaken democracy;
- 3) will have a tendency to stereotype public education;
- 4) will run into a direct conflict with the cultural program of the public schools;
- 5) will weaken the philosophy of the child's education;
- 6) will jeopardize academic freedom in the classroom;
- 7) will emasculate the current program of the public school;
- 8) will emphasize sectarianism.

He desired religion to be taught in the public schools, "but personal faith must be inculcated by the churches. We need the help of the churches."

Most of those in attendance teach in the weekday schools of the churches affiliated with the International Council. By a show of hands approximately 70% of those in attendance were former public school teachers.

The convention registration was approximately 1,400. The Week-day Section was attended by approximately 70 to 80 people. Seventeen sections were in session simultaneously.

The group was much interested in this topic, and many were sympathetic to the work which we are doing in our schools. They showed deep concern about permitting children to grow up without religious instruction.

One woman, an ordained Methodist minister, in a private conversation voiced deep appreciation of the fact that her early schooling had been in a Lutheran school.

In a meeting of the International Council, attended by representatives of the various sections, the opinion was adopted that "religion is seriously weakened if it is not intimately related to general education." The Council opposes the complete secularization of the public schools.

The Council accepted the report of one of the sections that to open many Protestant parochial schools would create too many problems to justify this effort, and then, unfortunately, approved the opinion that the operation of Protestant parochial schools on a universal or even widely adopted scale would be a serious threat to public education and to our democracy. In this last statement they, in my opinion, go too far and become guilty of making a statement which cannot be justified and which is not in agreement with historical fact.

St. Louis, Mo.



Sermon Study on Isaiah 28:23-29

A PARABLE OF GOD'S HUSBANDRY

By WALTER R. ROEHRS

"All these things spake Jesus unto the multitude in parables; and without a parable spake He not unto them" (Matt. 13:34). He used "earthly stories with heavenly meaning" that have no equal. "Never man spake like this Man" (John 7:46), because "He taught them as One having authority and not as the scribes" (Matt. 7:29). But holy men, moved by the Holy Ghost, also used this teaching device with telling effect. The Old Testament parables are perhaps not so well known. They commend themselves for pulpit use because they present familiar lessons in a different setting. The pastor may want to use them for a series of evening sermons.

A PARAPHRASE

God has something important to tell you. *Give ye ear, and hear my voice; hearken, and hear my speech.*

You can learn this lesson by watching the tiller of the soil. As you observe him going about his work, you realize that he knows what he is doing. He has intelligence which enables him to do things for a purpose and to plan his work for the result that he has in mind. When it is time to sow, you see him preparing the soil. *But does the plowman keep plowing all the time? Is he forever opening and harrowing his ground?* The answer is no. He does not plow merely to turn over the soil; he does not harrow merely to cut up the ground. He does this with an end in view. *After leveling the surface of the ground, doth he not cast abroad the fitches, and scatter the cummin, and set the wheat in rows and the barley in the appointed place and the rye in its place?*

The farmer is able to plan and do one thing to achieve another because his Creator has endowed him with this gift. *For his God doth instruct him to discretion and doth teach him.*

Watch the farmer also at the time of harvest for further evidence of his ability to act intelligently. He knows that he can't treat all his crops alike if he is to have the desired results. If he does not act with discrimination, he would ruin his

harvest, and so he adjusts the method of threshing to the various crops. *For the fitches are not threshed with a threshing instrument, neither is a cartwheel turned about upon the cummin; but the fitches are beaten out with a staff, and the cummin with a rod.*

Again notice that, guided by his intelligence, he does not overdo his threshing. He knows when to stop dragging the sledge over the wheat lest he destroy the grain. *He will not forever be threshing it, nor break it with the wheel of his cart, nor bruise it with his horsemen. Bread corn is bruised, yes, it is true, but just enough to free it from the hull which encumbers it, no more. He does not crush it.*

And now apply this parable to God's dealings with you. If *this also cometh forth from the Lord of Hosts*, if the farmer knows how to plan to achieve his purpose because *God doth instruct him to discretion and doth teach him*, is it not reasonable to suppose that divine husbandry is also carefully planned for a purpose? Yes, it is even in a much higher degree. God does plan your life carefully, purposefully, with individual discrimination, because *He is wonderful in counsel*. He can do the right thing at the right time in the right measure because *He is excellent in working*.

HOMILETICAL SUGGESTIONS *

This parable uses the tiller of the soil as a *tertium comparationis*, but the lesson to be learned is different from that of the sower of the seed spoken by Jesus. Here the emphasis is on the intelligent planning and the discretion of the farmer. Those activities of the farmer are stressed which might appear drastic, violent, and even destructive. Why does he lacerate and wound the earth by plowing and harrowing? Why does he treat his crops so violently at threshing time?

The answer is that he engages in these activities not for their own sakes. Being endowed by his Creator with the ability to plan and to execute for a purpose, he does certain things to achieve the end that he has in mind. He does not plow just to be cutting up the countryside. He does not harrow merely to see the clods break up into small pieces. This is evident from the fact that he does not keep on plowing

* The order of the presentation here is merely one of convenience. The sermonizer begins with the study of the text and the context.

and harrowing forever. He engages in this seemingly destructive activity as a means to an end: he wants to sow seed which is to grow into sturdy plants and bear fruit.

Again at harvesttime he does not keep on threshing just to be threshing. He beats his crops with a staff and rolls the wheel of his cart upon them not merely to subject them to violence. He engages in this activity for the sole purpose of getting the crop safely into his granary.

A second example of the farmer's God-given ability to plan purposefully and to execute intelligently appears in the discrimination that he exercises. To treat his crops alike would be ruinous. When he has cummin and other small-seeded crops before him on the threshing floor, he does not use the heavy, spiked threshing sledge that he applies when he is harvesting the larger crops. He adjusts his treatment to the crop.

And, finally, the farmer is endowed by God to know when he has achieved his purpose. He knows when to quit threshing. Even when he uses the heavy instruments, he stops before he has crushed the grain. There is just enough threshing to free the wheat from the hull and to gather it into his storehouse.

That's the earthly story. The application is one of *a minori ad maius*. It is already suggested in v. 26, which stresses the fact that it is God who has given the tiller of the soil a mind that can plan and discriminate. Is it not reasonable to suppose that God Himself can and does deal with men in the same way? The answer is an emphatic yes. The Lord of Hosts is wonderful in counsel and excellent in working.

The parable focuses our attention on only one aspect in the planning of our lives by God. We usually do not need to be reminded that the things which we consider good come to us by divine providence. However, when the bitter moments come, we need the instruction and the comfort that "this also cometh from the Lord of Hosts." They do not overtake us because we are the victims of a blind fate. They happen, not because God could not prevent their happening. They come because God has planned them for His good purpose.

The staff and the rod are used in other figurative language of Scripture as implements of God's chastisement. Our

English word *tribulation* comes from the Latin *tribulum*, a threshing sledge. We also speak of "harrowing" experiences. The plow is an instrument for cutting.

The chief thoughts of the parable fall into place quite readily:

TRIBULATIONS COME FROM GOD

- A. He plans them to achieve a good purpose.
- B. He plans them in proportion to the individual needs.
- C. He plans them not to exceed our endurance.

The sermon may deal with the tribulations in general in the life of the child of God. The text can also be applied to comfort those stricken by specific and very severe strokes of adversity, for example, as a funeral sermon at the occasion of an "untimely" death.

Or the preacher may want to widen the sphere of God's husbandry to take in the acre of national or world events; in fact, this application follows most closely from the context. In the previous verses the Prophet pronounces the doom of destruction upon Judah. "The twenty-eighth chapter of the book of Isaiah is one of his greatest prophecies. It is distinguished by that regal versatility of style which places its author at the head of Hebrew writers." (G. A. Smith, *The Book of Isaiah*, Volume I, p. 153.) In withering rhetoric he denounces the sins of the nation and writes God's *finis* over it. But there is a "residue of His people." There is a faithful remnant. For their comfort this parable is appended. There is no doubt that a sermon on this text would mean much to the children of God in devastated Europe and Asia. As a nation we may need it, too.

EXEGETICAL NOTES

V. 23. After Jesus had spoken the Parable of the Sower, He added similar words: "Who hath ears to hear, let him hear," Matt. 13:9. Cf. also Ps. 49:1 and 78:1.

V. 24. *Kol hayyom*, translated by the A. V. "all day." The emphatic adverbial modifier is placed first. Luther translates better: "immerdar"; also R. V.: "continually." It is the poetic expression for the more prosaic *kol hayyamim*: all the days. It is translated by the A. V. with "continually," "daily," "forever," in such passages as Ps. 42:3, 10; 52:1; 56:1-2, etc. — The verbs, in the imperfect tense, denote the repeated action:

we see the plowman cutting furrow after furrow and making round after round. — *Yepatach*: this verb takes up the more usual word for plowing used in the first part of the verse. The A. V. translates it quite literally: "Doth he open?" that is, "the ground." While it is used in the sense of plowing only here in the Old Testament, it is quite commonly employed for the work of the engraver: Ex. 28:9, 36; 1 Kings 7:36; 2 Chron. 2:6, 13, etc. — *Wisaddedh*: "and he breaks," that is, the "clods" (A. V.). The word "clods" is not in the text, but is correctly supplied. The verb comes from the root meaning to be straight, even, level. The causative form gives the meaning: to make even, to level. In Job 39:10 the A. V. translates: "Canst thou bind the unicorn with his band in the furrow? or will he *harrow* the valleys after thee?" In Hosea 10:11: "Break his clods."

V. 25. *'Im shiwwah*: "When he hath made plain" (A. V.). This verb has as its first meaning: to put, place, set; then, to put in order, to make even. R. V.: "After leveling its surface." — For a description of fitches, cummin, barley, rye, cf. a Bible dictionary. The difference in the nature and size of these seeds is not so important here as in vv. 27-28, except to indicate that the farmer plans the planting and prepares the soil individually for each. — *Sorah*: "the principal wheat" (A. V.). This translation is based on the meaning of the root: to set in a row, range in order, and then to be first in the row, to be chief, leader. The parallelism suggests the use of the word as an adverbial accusative: to set the wheat in rows. In the Orient wheat is often planted thus. The LXX omits. Jerome: *per ordinem*. — *Nisman*: "the appointed barley." The form of the word is a Niphal participle. It means to be marked off, designated, and is likewise best construed adverbially: in the appointed place. Luther combined these two modifiers, reproducing the meaning correctly: "saeet Weizen und Gerste, jegliches wo er's hin haben will."

V. 26 already hints at the application: it is God who makes it possible for the farmer to work intelligently. *Weyissero*: "doth instruct him." The verb in its more usual meaning implies a drastic teaching: to chastise, punish by blows, and it is so translated by the A. V. in Deut. 22:18; 1 Kings 12:11; Prov. 19:18, etc. Or the chastening may be in words: to admonish, exhort, as in Prov. 9:7; Job 4:3; Ps. 16:7. Hence

Luther made this verse apply directly to God's visitation upon His people by making a plural of the third person singular suffix: "also zuechtiget *sie* auch *ihr* Gott." It seems preferable to make the verb have the more general connotation of teaching, instructing, which is reflected in the second verb in this verse, just as *yasar* is bracketed with *lamadh* in Ps. 94:10. The context demands that the object of the instruction be the plowman. At the same time this word keeps contact with the whole question under consideration: God uses the rod at times to educate His children. *Lammishpat* — A. V.: "to discretion"; R. V.: "aright"; Luther: "durch Recht." In Jer. 30:11 and 46:26 the same verb and prepositional phrase occurs: "I will correct thee in measure." If the latter is a correct rendition, then the blending of parable and application in this verse becomes still clearer. It also connects what has gone before with the following illustration from the work of the farmer. If the sentence is merely to present the thought that man has received the ability to act judiciously, then the phrase could very well be translated: His God instructs him to do the right thing. I prefer the latter. Strack-Zoeckler: "er hat ihn unterwiesen zum rechten Brauch, es unterrichtete ihn sein Gott."

V. 27. The *ki*, "for," introduces the proof of the rational ability of the farmer to discriminate. The difference in the threshing implements used is important. For a description compare a Bible dictionary.

V. 28. *Lechem*, literally, "bread"; "grain" is to be supplied. The larger grain used for flour is meant in distinction from the smaller leguminous produce just mentioned. *Yudaq* is a Hophal from the root *duq*. Its primary meaning is to beat, bruise in pieces, tread, trample, crush; then to tread out grain by driving cattle upon the grain, cf. Jer. 50:11; Hos. 10:11; 1 Chron. 21:20. The last verb in this verse, *yeduqqennu*, is derived from the kindred root *daqaq*. Gesenius suggests that it is used in a play upon a twofold usage and translates: "Bread-corn is *beaten out*, but yet one does not thresh it always . . . nor does he *crush* it." This appears to be more in keeping with the contrast that is implied than to translate the first part in the form of a question: "Is bread-corn crushed? Nay, but one does not thresh it forever . . . and does not crush it." In either case the meaning is clear. There is

a progression of thought from the preceding verse. It is true the farmer uses the heaviest machinery for some grains, but even in that case he stops his threshing before he has ground the kernels to dust. Luther does not agree: "man mahlt es, dass es Brot werde." — The infinitive absolute *adosh* occurs only here. — Haman: to put in motion with the derived meaning: to put in commotion, to discomfit, to destroy utterly. Here the meaning must be to impel the wheel with its crushing power. — God's severe visitation on Israel had been compared by the Prophet to threshing in Chap. 21:10: "O my threshing and the corn of my flour!"

V. 29. This verse takes up v. 26 and points out again the fact that man derives his power of discretion and discrimination from God: "This also cometh from the Lord of Hosts," and then adds that God possesses in the highest degree what He teaches His creature. He is "wonderful in counsel." *Etsah* is used first of all of a purpose or plan, Is. 19:3; 29:15; Jer. 18:23. With the verb *asah* it means: to execute a counsel, to carry out a purpose, Is. 30:1, etc. Then it also has the connotation of counsel as a quality of mind: deliberation, prudence, wisdom, cf. Is. 11:2; Prov. 8:14; Jer. 32:19. God can plan; yes, His thoughts are above ours as the heaven is higher than the earth. The Messiah is called Wonderful, Counselor. But God is not only a dreamer of dreams, He can put His thoughts into effectual working; He is "excellent in working." While the word *tushiyyah* is a synonym of *etsah* in the sense of counsel, wisdom, understanding, it appears to have the further connotation of carrying out a purpose, undertaking, enterprise. Thus Job 5:12: "Their hands cannot perform their enterprises." Luther: "und fuehret es herrlich hinaus."

Contributors to This Issue

Mr. L. W. Spitz, a graduate of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo., is instructor in the department of history at the University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.

The Rev. Clarence Peters is pastor of St. Luke's Lutheran Church, St. Louis, Mo.

Prof. W. R. Roehrs holds a chair in the Old Testament department at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo.

Homiletics

A Series of Sermon Studies for the Church Year

PENTECOST

HEB. 8:8-11

The Text and the Day. — Pentecost (Acts 2:1) was also designated as the Festival of the First Fruits. Fittingly Pentecost now is dedicated to the thought of the fruits of the work of the Holy Ghost. The text describes those in whom this fruit is to be found and how it is grown.

Notes on Meaning. — The burden of chap. 8 is that Christ's ministry has fully replaced the Aaronic priesthood. We live in the Gospel era, the last that God will give to men. In this era the promises of the Gospel are better than the demands of the Law. Since the old covenant of the Law could not meet all demands for the salvation of man, God made provision for a new covenant that could (v. 7). The text establishes this fact by a long reference to Old Testament revelation, Jer. 31:31-34.

V. 8: "with them," those who lived under the old covenant. "New covenant," the Gospel. — V. 9: The old and new covenants stemmed from the mercy of God, "took them by the hand." — V. 10: "Mind," understanding; "heart," loving memory. — V. 11: "not teach every man his fellow citizen." The new covenant is not for a single people or race where special teachers or priests were necessary whose instructions were essential as mediatory actions. The wide dissemination of the Gospel light no longer requires such intermediate action.

Preaching Pitfalls. — Beware of spending too much time on an explanation and description of the old covenant that the real message of the text and of Pentecost is overshadowed. — A comparison of the two covenants must be made, if made at all, on the basis of the old as a symbol of the new. — God is not finding fault with His own action in giving the old covenant. — By quoting from Jeremiah the author of Hebrews establishes that God in the Old Testament stressed the essential needs of a real forgiveness of sin and genuine communion with God. — Although the entire chapter speaks of the great

high-priestly office of Christ, the assigned text section does not directly refer to the Atonement. The appended sermon outline takes for granted that this will be stressed under IV, B on the basis of v. 12, which, we believe, should have been included in the text.

Preaching Emphases. — As introduction the writer used Acts 2:38 and attendant circumstances as the lead to the thought: Why Pentecost? — Starke: "How blessed are we in the New Covenant! Is it not our shame that we still remain under the dominion of sin? — God adheres faithfully to His covenant and promise; men are the covenant-breakers. — Perceivest thou that the law of God has been traced by the pen of the Holy Spirit upon thy mind and heart?" — Rieger: "Those who were under the Old Testament said: We will! and did not know that they *could* not. Now that the grace of the New Testament has made it possible, many shield themselves under the pretext of a *cannot*, but there is a real *will not*." — Heubner: "The old covenant is past. Would to God that the old spirit of slavish service were gone with it, and the new spirit of willingness and love reigned in all."

Problem and Goal. — Heb. 2:1-4.

Outline:

THE MESSAGE OF PENTECOST

- I. Its Content.
 - A. A message of forgiving love.
 - B. A message of promise.
- II. Its Author.
 - A. The unchanging God.
 - B. The loving God.
- III. Its Address.
 - A. Is direct.
 - B. Is universal.
 - C. Is personal.
- IV. Its Desired Result.
 - A. Recognition of the insufficiency of man.
 - B. Recognition of the sufficiency of God.

H. B. ROEPE

TRINITY

TITUS 3:4-8

The Text and the Day.—While a discussion of the work of each of the three persons of the holy Trinity based on our text would hardly be far-fetched, the text does better serve the purpose of exhorting Christian people to be mindful of their blessed estate and of their sacred obligations throughout the long and ensuing Trinity season. The season will be neither dull nor uneventful if throughout we will but heed our text and its message.

Notes on Meaning.—V. 4: The two Greek words here used for *kindness and love* usually go together. The word used by Paul for "love" is *philanthroopia*, which, unlike its English derivative, originally almost always meant the love of a god to a human being, rarely love of people for people. *Of God, our Savior*: really, "of our Savior God," refers to the Trinity, especially the Father, who sent His Son and the Comforter. The same applies to the pronoun "He" of verse 6.—V. 5. There is a human *dikaioσύνη*, but it has no saving value. *Dia loutrou*: by the washing; Baptism, which is performed in the name of the Trinity. "Regeneration": defines the nature of the washing; the washing of a new birth. *Anakainώσεως*: "renewing," a subsequent process which follows birth and operates constantly. Baptism is not merely a symbol, but an active and effective means of grace.—V. 6 "Shed on us": e. g., at Pentecost, through the Word, through the Sacraments. All gifts of the Holy Spirit that come to us are a continuation of the Pentecostal outpouring. Relationship of Trinity Sunday to Pentecost.—V. 7: "heirs"; the highest point to which man can attain in this life. "Being justified": the righteousness of Christ is imputed to us.—V. 8: *Diabebαιουσθαι*: to assert with utter confidence and to affirm constantly. *Phrontidsoosin*: to be very anxious and concerned about something; *proistasthai*: to occupy yourself (in good works), to be deeply concerned about these.

Preaching Pitfalls.—The present text is directed against preaching and living in such a manner that the impression is given that good works should not concern us too greatly. "Affirm constantly, that they which have believed in God, *might be careful to maintain good works.*" Thus not only James, but even Paul stresses the importance of good works.

Preaching Emphases.—The lessons appointed for the Trinity season point out to us the kindness and love of God toward man, shed on us *abundantly* through Jesus; by being careful to maintain good works we, as children of God, show that we are appreciative of the saving mercy of God and that our lives reflect, though necessarily in small measure, the kindness and love of God our Savior toward us.

Problem and Goal.—The Cretans, to whom Titus preached, were steeped in sin and iniquity, particularly in self-deception and pride. Hence they likely found it hard to understand the meaning of Paul's words. May God keep us from steeping ourselves in spiritual ignorance and corruption to the extent that we fail to grasp God's message to us and hence fail to solve our problems on the basis of God's Word and fail, too, to reach our goal.

Outline:

RICH HARVESTS IN A BLESSED TRINITY SEASON

1. We are made heirs according to the hope of eternal life.
2. Our good works are good and profitable unto men.

W. E. BUSZIN

FIRST SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Rom. 8:5-11

The Text and the Day.—This text fits most appropriately to the thoughts of the propers for this day: *Epistle*, God's love to us prompts love to our neighbor in us; *Gospel*, selfishness of a carnal-minded man and his eventual doom; *Introit*, "trusted in Thy mercy, rejoice in Thy salvation"; *Gradual*, "Blessed is He that considereth the poor"; *Collect*, "We can do no good thing without Thee."

Notes on Meaning.—"Mind": center one's interest and desire on something . . . "flesh": natural man, Gal. 5:19 f.; "spirit": regenerate man, Gal. 5:22 ("spirit" should not be capitalized as in Authorized Version). . . . "To be carnally minded is death" means not only that it ends in death, but that it is even now carrying death in its bosom, 1 Tim. 5:6; Eph. 2:1, 5. . . . "Life and peace": the soul's deepest repose and true bliss and contentment. . . . "The Spirit of Christ" is, of course, the Holy Ghost. We have here a definite proof of

the doctrine of the Filioque. . . . "Righteousness in v. 10 is Christ's righteousness, which is imputed to us. . . . It is interesting to note the Trinitarian reference in the last verse: "that raised up Jesus": the Father; "Jesus": Son; "Spirit of Him": the Holy Ghost. . . . If we consider 2 Cor. 1:22 and Eph. 1:13-14, we shall have to prefer the accusative "because of His Spirit, who dwelleth in you," instead of the genitive, as the Authorized Version has it, "by His Spirit that dwelleth in you." There is no analogy in Scripture for the latter view.

Preaching Pitfalls. — It is important that when we use this text in a Christian congregation, though we recognize the possibility of a number in the audience being carnally minded (hypocrites), that we emphasize especially v. 9: "But ye are *not* in the flesh, but in the Spirit." . . . The phrase "Spirit of Christ" in v. 9 b must not be interpreted as meaning the spirit or the likeness of Christ, but must be applied directly to the Holy Spirit, whose indwelling will produce the likeness or spirit of Christ in our attitude toward life.

Preaching Emphases. — This text strikes at the very root of Pelagianism, which makes man his own savior by character and conduct, the basic doctrine of Freemasonry. It likewise disproves the Semi-Pelagianism of the Catholics, who try to meet God half-way. . . . We must point out most emphatically that there is no middle ground between the flesh and the spirit. There is a fundamental difference and an absolute cleavage. . . . What a marvelous occasion to emphasize the *sola gratia*!

Problem and Goal. — In the light of both the Epistle and the Gospel for this Sunday it should be our goal to show the people the real difference between a God-filled and a "God-less" person and thus between Lazarus, "who was after the spirit" and went to heaven, and the rich man, "who was after the flesh" and went to hell.

Outline:

THE FUNDAMENTAL DIFFERENCE BETWEEN AN
UNBELIEVER AND A CHRISTIAN

I. In his thinking and planning.

A. The goal the unbeliever sets before himself is selfish and carnal, v. 5; Phil. 3:19; whereas the goal of the Christian is to glorify Jesus, Col. 3:17; 1 Cor. 10:31.

B. If the thinking and planning of an unbeliever ever

seems to coincide with God's Law, it is never intentional, because he is against God always, vv. 7-8; whereas the Christian's whole thought and plan is to please Jesus and be as He is, vv. 9-10.

II. In his activity and destiny.

- A. The unbeliever's activity is rooted in death and leads to such an end; the Christian's activity brings life and peace, v. 6.
- B. The unbeliever sinks from temporal death into eternal death, the Christian is sure of a glorious resurrection unto life, v. 11.

WALTER W. STUENKEL

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

1 JOHN 1:5—2:2

The Text and the Day.—The day concerns the life of faith as it confronts spiritual obstacles—the antipathy of the world (the Epistle), the apathy and materialism of the flesh (the Gospel). Hence Introit and Collect remind of God's provision for continued faith. This text outlines the major obstacle and the central provision for faith.

Notes on Meaning.—The theme of the Epistle is that the men of God love one another, for God is Love. V. 5: The light of God, His Spirit, is pure and produces completely pure results. V. 6: Hence ungodly living puts the lie to our claim of belonging to God. V. 7: The behavior and thinking which stems from the Spirit of God implies that we love one another and that we continuously draw upon the redemption of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of sin. How can a person who is in the light speak of sinning at all? V. 8: The answer to that problem is that obviously we do have sin; this side of the grave marks of godlessness will always appear in us. The flesh lives side by side with, and in competition with, the Spirit, Rom. 7:14-25; Gal. 5:17. The fellowship with God implies especial sensitivity to sin and flesh within us, recognition of its scope and remains. Hence we acknowledge and recognize it. V. 9: This acknowledging and recognizing of sin in the man who is in fellowship with God counts on His faithfulness and His justice for forgiving our sins and for helping us

conquer sin. That faithfulness is in the love of God (1 John 4:7); His justice in forgiveness lies in the fact that He redeemed us through Jesus Christ (v. 7; 1 John 4:9). V. 10: Hence a person oblivious of sin within himself distorts and negates his whole faith in God; for God is the Forgiver of sin. Our fellowship with God is simply this, that we draw on Him for forgiveness; negating our sin means negating God. Chap. 2:1, 2: As we ponder this forgiveness, we do so not simply to escape the bad conscience for past sins, but to get the ability to stop sinning. Every sin turns us to the Lord Jesus, who is our Helper (*Parakletos*) in our relation with the Father; for He died for us and for all men and thus is the one Way by which we find forgiveness of sins with God and find the power of God to stop sinning.

Preaching Pitfalls. — This text is unworkable without adequate expression of the fact of the flesh existing side by side with the Spirit in the Christian. The significance of the text is not exhausted with a mere review of the Atonement in chap. 2; the conquest of sin, to which the text directs, involves the awareness of sin and the look toward God for the remedy. — The picture of "Advocate," 2:1, is in our speech limited to the forensic concept of the Atonement; in the original it has a wider bearing: not only He who applies forgiveness, but also He who helps to conquer sin.

Problem and Goal. — The problem to which this text alerts is the Christian's situation that his own sin may either lose significance in his mind because of complacent acceptance of the redemption or loom so tragic in his thinking that he is afraid to count on God for help. Hence the chief shortcoming of the Christian to which this text alerts is the insufficient insight into the meaning of the forgiveness of sins; and the goal of the text is to clarify that significance, not only mentally but practically, as both the end of guilt and the beginning of the life of love.

Outline:

THE CONTINUING ANSWER TO OUR NEED FOR GOD:
FORGIVENESS OF SINS

I. Our need for God is continuous.

- A. God's plan for man is that he be completely in His light — in fellowship with Him; and hence that he will completely love the brethren and walk in light.

B. Any darkness in thought and behavior marks a break of that fellowship, a frustration of the plan of God. Cf. Eph. 5:1-6.

C. If a man overlooks the presence of this sin in his life,
1. He is deceiving himself; for the flesh will exist side by side with the Spirit to the grave.
2. He overlooks the nature of God and the truth of God; for God's purpose and nature is to forgive sin and to meet this continuous problem.

II. God has continuous forgiveness in Christ.

A. God meets the problems of our sin through Jesus Christ.

1. He is the *Propitiation* for our sin; He suffered and died for the sins of the whole world; because of Him God does not impute sin to the sinner. Cf. 2 Cor. 5:18-21.

2. He is our Helper against sin; for through His Spirit and His indwelling in the believer sin can be replaced progressively with godliness.

B. Hence the Christian believer, under the continual threat of sin,

1. Realizes that it is the aim of his life to stop sinning and to walk in the light.

2. Counts on Jesus Christ as his Helper and draws His power by contemplating His redemption.

RICHARD R. CAEMMERER



Miscellanea

"This Is My Body"

ROBERT GEORGE HOERBER

"This is My body" is the English translation of the Greek, τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου, which occurs in Matthew 26:26, Mark 14:22, and Luke 22:19. St. Paul records a variation of the statement in 1 Corinthians 11:24: τοῦτό μου ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν. The importance of this text in Lutheran, Reformed, and Roman Catholic theology is obvious. Its interpretation, therefore, must be based on sound grammatical principles. One point of grammar in the sentence which has caused much concern to theologians in their interpretation is the gender of τοῦτο. Carlstadt, for example, proposed that Christ must have pointed to Himself when He declared: "This is My body."¹ He perhaps could not understand how τοῦτο, being neuter, could refer to bread (ἄρτος), which is masculine.

Although Carlstadt's suggestion is ridiculous, the grammatical point involved has apparently vexed also Lutheran theologians. *The Conservative Reformation and Its Theology*, by Charles P. Krauth,² contains the following statements: "Those who have entered the lists against the doctrine of our Church [i. e., Lutheran] usually insist that 'this' qualifies 'bread' understood, that is, the pronoun *touto*, which is neuter, qualifies the noun, which is masculine. Determined to be fettered by no laws of language, they abrogate the rule — that a pronoun shall agree with the noun it qualifies in gender (p. 609). . . . The Church [i. e., Lutheran] does not consider the neuter pronoun as qualifying the masculine noun (p. 610). . . . Now, 'touto' does not agree in gender with 'artos,' and 'artos' may, therefore, not be supplied (p. 668). . . . Not one instance can be found from Genesis to Malachi, in the Septuagint, or from Matthew to Revelation, in the New Testament, in which such a conjunction must be made as that of *touto neuter* with *artos masculine*, in order to reach the full sense of a passage (p. 669). . . . The accepted view of the *Lutheran* theologians is

¹ Cf. Luther, Vol. XX: pp. 221—222 (St. Louis Edition, 1890); J. T. Mueller, *Christian Dogmatics*, p. 514.

² Philadelphia: The United Lutheran Publication House, 1871. Cf. *The Lutheran Commentary*, edited by Henry Eyster Jacobs (New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1895), Vol. II, pp. 319—320. *The Interpretation of St. Matthew's Gospel*, R. C. H. Lenski (Columbus, Ohio: The Wartburg Press, 1943), pp. 1025—1026. *Popular Commentary of the Bible — The New Testament*, P. E. Kretzmann (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1921), Vol. I, p. 146. *An American Commentary on the New Testament: Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*, John A. Broadus (Philadelphia: The American Baptist Publication Society, 1886), p. 529. *The Greek Testament*, Henry Alford (London, 1863), Vol. I, p. 266. *A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures: The Gospel According to Matthew*, Lange-Schaff (New York: Charles Scribner, 1866), p. 470. Cf. Krauth, *op. cit.*, pp. 672—673.

that *touto* cannot refer grammatically to *artos*. This is especially illustrated among those we have examined by Gerhard, Quenstedt, Calovius, Carpzov, Oliarius, Scherzer, Bengel, and the best of our earlier and later commentators (p. 671)."

The dogmatic character of Krauth's statements is amusing, for the point of grammar is rather simple and has numerous illustrations throughout classical literature. In brief, the demonstrative pronouns are frequently attracted in gender to the predicate nominative both in Latin and Greek. Since so many of our theologians are exposed to the dogmatic and confused treatment of Krauth, it should be of value to treat this point in more detail by giving copious examples from classical literature.

While reading Vergil's *Aeneid* in leisure moments, we noticed in the first six books several examples of the attraction of the demonstrative pronoun to the predicate nominative.

Urbs antiqua fuit (Tyrîi tenuere coloni),
Carthago, Italiam contra Tiberinaque longe
ostia, dives opum, studiisque asperrima belli,
quam Iuno fertur terris magis omnibus unam
posthabita coluisse Samo: hic illius arma,
hic currus fuit; *hoc* regnum dea gentibus esse,
si qua Fata sinant, iam tum tenditque fovetque.

I, 12—18

Hoc refers to *urbs*, but is attracted into the gender of the predicate noun *regnum*.

Trunca manu pinus regit et vestigia firmat;
lanigeræ comitantur oves; *ea* sola voluptas
solamenque mali.

III, 659—661

Oves is the antecedent of *ea*; *ea* derives its gender and number from the predicate noun *voluptas* (*est*).

Hinc Drepani me portus et inlaetabilis ora
accipit. Hic, pelagi tot tempestatibus actus,
heu genitorem, omnis curae casusque levamen,
amitto Anchisen; hic me, pater optime, fessum
deseris, heu tantis nequiquam erepte periclis!
Nec vates Helenus, cum multa horrenda moneret,
hos mihi praedixit luctus, non dira Celaeno.
Hic labor extremus, longarum *haec* meta viarum;
hinc me digressum vestris deus appulit oris.

III, 707—715

Hic and *haec* are attracted into the gender and number of *labor* and *meta*, respectively, although they refer to the death of Anchises.

His ego nigrantem commixta grandine nimbum,
dum trepidant alae saltusque indagine cingunt,
desuper infundam, et tonitru caelum omne ciebo.
Diffugient comites, et nocte tegentur opaca;
speluncam Dido dux et Troianus eandem
devenient. Adero, et, tua si mihi certa voluntas,
conubio iungam stabili propriamque dicabo;
hic Hymenaeus erit.

IV, 120—127

Hic agrees in gender with the predicate nominative *Hymenaeus*; its antecedent is the description in lines 120—126.

Sed nunc Italiam magnam Gryneus Apollo,
Italiam Lyciae iussere capessere sortes;
hic amor, *haec* patria est.

IV, 345—347

Although *hic* and *haec* both refer to Italy, they are attracted into the gender of their respective predicate nominatives.

Heu! Furiis incensa feror! Nunc augur Apollo,
nunc Lyciae sortes, nunc et Iove missus ab ipso
interpres divum fert horrida iussa per auras.
Scilicet is superis labor est, *ea* cura quietos
sollicitat.

IV, 376—380

Is and *ea* agree in gender with *labor* and *cura*, respectively, although both refer to the thought of *Nunc augur . . . auras*.

Talibus orabat dictis, arasque tenebat,
cum sic orsa loqui vates: Sate sanguine divum,
Tros Anchisiade, facilis decensus Averno
(noctis atque dies patet atri ianua Ditis);
sed revocare gradum superasque evadere ad auras,
hoc opus, *hic* labor est.

VI, 124—129

Both *hoc* and *hic* sum up the preceding line; they agree in gender with *opus* and *labor*, respectively.

Hi tibi Nomentum, et Gabios, urbemque Fidenam,
hi Collatinas imponent montibus arcis,
Pometios, Castrumque Inui, Bolamque, Coramque:
haec tum nomina erunt, nunc sunt sine nomine terrae.

VI, 773—776

Haec is attracted into the gender of *nomina*, the predicate nominative, although its antecedents are the towns mentioned in the previous three lines.

An example of attraction occurs also with a relative pronoun in Vergil's *Aeneid*, VI, 608—614:

Hic, quibus invisi fratres, dum vita manebat,
pulsatusve parens, et fraus innexa clienti,
aut qui divitiis soli incubuere repertis
nec partem posuere suis, *quae* maxima turba est,
quique ob adulterium caesi, quique arma secuti
impia nec veriti dominorum fallere dextras,
inclusi poenam exspectant.

Quae agrees in gender with its predicate nominative, although its antecedent is masculine in gender.

In order that no one may suppose that attraction in gender to the predicate nominative is limited to Latin poetry, we shall list a few illustrations from Latin prose before taking up examples

in Greek. Caesar begins the fourth book of his *Commentarii De Bello Gallico* thus:

Ea quae secuta est hieme, qui fuit annus Cn. Pompeio
M. Crasso consulibus . . .

The relative pronoun *qui* is attracted in gender to its predicate nominative (*annus*), although its antecedent (*hieme*) is feminine.

The *Germania* of Tacitus contains numerous examples of the same principle.

. . . et in proximo pignora, unde feminarum ululatus
audiri, unde vagitus infantium. *Hi* cuique sanctissimi
testes, *hi* maximi laudatores . . .

Chap. 7

Tum in ipso concilio vel principum aliquis vel pater
vel propinqui scuto frameaque iuvenem ornant: *haec*
apud illos toga, *hic* primus iuventae honos; ante hoc
domus pars videntur, mox rei publicae.

Chap. 13

Haec dignitas, *hae* vires, magno semper et electorum
iuvenum globo circumdari, in pace decus, in bello
praesidium.

Chap. 13

Nec solum in sua gente cuique, sed apud finitimas
quoque civitates *id* nomen, *ea* gloria est, si numero
ac virtute comitatus emineat . . .

Chap. 13

Intersunt parentes aut propinqui ac munera probant,
munera non ad delicias muliebres quaesita nec quibus
nova nupta comatur, sed boves et frenatum equum et
scutum cum framea gladioque. In haec munera uxor
accipitur atque in vicem ipsa armorum aliquid viro
affert: *hoc* maximum vinculum, *haec* arcana sacra,
hos coniugales deos arbitrantur.

Chap. 18

Plurimis Chattorum hic placet habitus, iamque canent
insignes et hostibus simul suisque monstrati. Omnium
penes hos initia pugnarum; *haec* prima semper acies . . .

Chap. 31

Tencteri super solitum bellorum decus equestris
disciplinae arte praecellunt; nec maior apud Chattos
peditum laus quam Tencteris equitum. Sic instituere
maiores: posterius imitantur. *Hi* lusus infantium,
haec iuvenem aemulatio: perseverant senes.

Chap. 32

Iuxta Hermunduros Naristi ac deinde Marcomani et
Quadi agunt. Praecipua Marcomanorum gloria viresque,
atque ipsa etiam sedes pulsus olim Boiis virtute
parta. Nec Naristi Quadive degenerant. *Eaque* Ger-
maniae velut frons est, quatenus Danuvio peragitur.

Chap. 42

The following two illustrations of attraction in gender to the predicate nominative are from Livy:

Ianiculum quoque adiectum, non inopia loci, sed
ne quando *ea* arx hostium esset. I, 33

Inter consules ita copiae divisae: Sempronio datae
legiones duae—*ea* quaterna milia erant peditum
et treceni equites . . . XXI, 17³

In Greek literature likewise "the demonstrative pronoun is commonly attracted into the gender of the predicate."⁴ Frequent illustrations occur in classical Greek.

ἐκεῖνος δ' ἐστὶν ἔλεγχος μέγιστος . . . Lysias XVI, 6

νομίζοντες καὶ τῆς πόλεως ταύτην ἱκανωτάτην εἶναι σωτηρίαν
καὶ τῶν ἐχθρῶν μεγίστην τιμωρίαν. Lysias XXV, 23

ταύτην γὰρ τέχνην ἔχει. Lysias I, 16

αὕτη ἐστὶν ἀνδρὸς ἀρετή, ἱκανὸν εἶναι τὰ τῆς πόλεως
πράττειν . . . Plato, *Meno*, 71 e

οὗτοι δὴ Ἀθηναῖοί γε, ὃ Εὐθύφρων, δίκην αὐτὴν καλοῦσιν,
ἀλλὰ γραφὴν. Plato, *Euthyphro*, 2 a

ὥς ταύτης οὔσης φύσεως ψυχῆς (τὸ αὐτὸ ἑαυτὸ κινοῦν) . . .
Plato, *Phaedrus*, 245 e

εἰ δὲ μή, καὶ παρὰ τῶν προγεγενημένων μανθάνετε· αὕτη γὰρ
ἀρίστη διδασκαλία. Xenophon, *Cyr.*, VIII, 7, 24

κίνησις γὰρ αὕτη μεγίστη . . . ἐγένετο. Thucydides I, 1, 2

Ἡροδότου Ἀλικαρνησέος ἱστορίας ἀπόδεξις ἦδε . . .
Herodotus I, 1

ἀκτὴ μὲν ἦδε . . . Λήμνου. Sophocles, *Ph.*, 1—2

αἰδῶς μὲν νῦν ἦδε . . . Ἴλιον εἰσαναβῆναι . . .
Homer, *Iliad*, XVII, 336—337

In the light of this evidence it is clear that C. P. Krauth momentarily forgot a point of grammar of the classical languages when he wrote the statements cited above on the gender of τοῦτο in the text, "This is My body." Nor had he read the New Testament in Greek with a sufficiently discerning eye. For then he could not have declared so dogmatically: "Not one instance can be

³ Cf. Cicero, *Tusc.*, I, 23, 53—54.

⁴ *Syntax of Classical Greek*, B. L. Gildersleeve (American Book Company: Part I, 1900; Part II, 1911), p. 58.

found from Genesis to Malachi, in the Septuagint, or from Matthew to Revelation, in the New Testament, in which such a conjunction must be made as that of *touto neuter* with *artos masculine*, in order to reach the full sense of a passage."⁵ "Such a conjunction" is easily explained and even expected on the basis of the grammatical rule that demonstrative pronouns are commonly attracted into the gender of the predicate nominative; and this rule obtains also in the New Testament. Several examples are the following:

τὸ δὲ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας πεσόν, οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀκούσαντες . . .

Luke 8:14

τὸ δὲ ἐν τῇ καλῇ γῇ, οὗτοί εἰσιν οἵτινες ἐν καρδίᾳ καλῇ καὶ ἀγαθῇ ἀκούσαντες . . .

Luke 8:15

πάντα οὖν ὅσα ἐὰν θέλητε ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς· οὗτος γάρ ἐστιν ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται.

Matthew 7:12

καὶ αὕτη αὐτοῖς ἡ παρ' ἐμοῦ διαθήκη, ὅταν ἀφέλωμαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν.

Romans 11:27

ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις ἐξῆλθεν δόγμα παρὰ Καίσαρος Αὐγούστου ἀπογράφεσθαι πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην. αὕτη ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη ἐγένετο ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηνίου.

Luke 2:1-2

αὕτη γάρ ἐστιν ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα τὰς ἐντολάς αὐτοῦ τηρῶμεν . . .

1 John 5:3

αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία τοῦ θεοῦ, ὅτι μεμαρτύρηκεν περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ.

1 John 5:9

καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία, ὅτι ζωὴν αἰώνιον ἔδωκεν ὁ θεὸς ἡμῖν . . .

1 John 5:11

καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ παρρησία ἣν ἔχομεν πρὸς αὐτόν, ὅτι ἐάν τι αἰτώμεθα κατὰ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ ἀκούει ἡμῶν.

1 John 5:14⁶

It is, therefore, to put it mildly, disconcerting to read that "the accepted view of the *Lutheran* theologians is that *touto* cannot refer grammatically to *artos*. This is especially illustrated among those we have examined by Gerhard, Quenstedt, Calovius, Carpzov, Oliarius, Scherzer, Bengel, and the best of our earlier and later commentators."⁷ The preceding evidence clearly demonstrates that *τοῦτο*, although neuter, can refer grammatically to *ἄρτος*, in view of the gender of *σῶμα*, the predicate nominative.

Attraction of the demonstrative pronoun, however, to the

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 669.

⁶ Cf. Luke 8:11; 22:53; John 1:19; 1 Corinthians 9:3; Matthew 22:38; John 2:11.

⁷ Krauth, *op. cit.*, p. 671.

gender of the predicate nominative does not always occur in Latin, classical Greek, and the New Testament.⁸ In such cases the construction according to sense rather than the grammatical gender may prevail, or the demonstrative may retain the gender of its antecedent and not become assimilated to the predicate nominative in gender. The question, then, arises whether there is any difference in meaning between those instances in which the demonstrative pronoun assimilates itself to the predicate nominative and those in which it retains agreement with its antecedent. The difference appears to be one of slight emphasis. Attraction to the predicate nominative may stress to a degree the predicate nominative, while agreement with the antecedent (rather than assimilation to the predicate nominative) would place the emphasis on the antecedent.

The accent of τοῦτό ἐστιν is worthy of note, distinguishing it from the phrase τοῦτ' ἐστιν. The latter is the equivalent of "that is," "*id est*" and "*hoc est*." It appears in the New Testament without any regard for number, case, and gender of either the antecedent or the predicate nominative.⁹ The accent on the penult of the verb stresses the idea of existence.

The article in the predicate shows that the sentence expresses a convertible proposition — the subject and predicate are identical and interchangeable.¹⁰ The presence of the article, therefore, is natural in the text; for τὸ σῶμά μου is the only way of expressing "My body." The absence of the article would imply "a body of mine."

Summary

The statement τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου is correctly translated: "This is My body." The gender of the demonstrative pronoun is natural, being attracted into the gender of the predicate nominative, τὸ σῶμά μου; the reference may very well be to ἄνθρωπος although it is masculine. The only grammatical implication in the attraction of the demonstrative pronoun to the gender of the predicate nominative is that the predicate nominative may have a slight stress instead of the antecedent. That is, the emphasis may be "This is My body" rather than "This is My body." The accent of the verb argues against the translation "This is My body." The presence of the article in the predicate reveals that "This is a body of Mine" would also be an incorrect rendering of Christ's declaration.

Fulton, Missouri

⁸ Vergil, *Aeneid*, III, 173; Lysias III, 28; Plato, *Gorgias*, 478 c, 492 c, 492 e; Plato, *Phaedrus*, 245 c; Xenophon, *Cyropaedia*, I, 3, 10; Acts 8: 10; 9: 15; 2 Peter 2: 17; Revelation 11: 4; 1 Peter 2: 19-20; Philippians 3: 7; 1 Corinthians 6: 11; 10: 6.

⁹ Cf. 1 Peter 3: 20; Romans 7: 18; Mark 7: 2; Acts 19: 4; Hebrews 13: 15; 9: 11; 11: 16; 7: 5; 2: 14; Philemon 12; Matthew 27: 46.

¹⁰ Gildersleeve, *op. cit.*, pp. 324-328. *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, A. T. Robertson (Harper and Brothers, 1931), pp. 767-769. *Greek Grammar*, W. W. Goodwin and C. B. Gulick (Ginn and Company, 1930), paragraph 954.

Gal. 3:17 Once More

In the CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY issue of February of this year I gave a survey with some criticisms of an article written by the Rev. A. V. Neve, a member of the United Evangelical Lutheran Church (Danish) for the *Lutheran Outlook* of December, 1948. In that article the author opposes the view "that there were no inaccuracies in the original manuscripts" of the Scriptures. In listing what he calls "obvious inaccuracies in the Bible" he has a remark about Gal. 3:17. This is what he says: "In Gal. 3:17 Paul writes that the Law was given 430 years after the covenant of promise was made to Abraham. 430 years is the time of the Israelites' sojourn in Egypt. Jacob was 130 years old when he went to Egypt and Isaac was 60 years old when Jacob was born, which makes 620 years." In my brief remarks about his article I had endeavored to show that this passage could well be explained without the assumption that the holy writer erred. My comments were: "As to the promise given to Abraham, we may well conceive that what Paul has in mind is the last time that God gave the promise to the patriarchs in Canaan, at the time when Jacob was leaving Canaan with his family, going down to Egypt. It should be noted that in Gal. 3:17 Abraham is not mentioned, merely the giving of the promise is spoken of." In the *Outlook* for March the Rev. E. V. Neve publishes a rejoinder and directs particular attention to what I had said about Gal. 3:17. This is what he says: "I call your attention to the fact that Abraham is mentioned in Gal. 3:16. It is a wild stretch of the imagination to say that Paul meant Jacob in the next verse. Such exegesis violates every rule of sound exegesis and hermeneutics and it borders on the ridiculous when attempts are made to have Christ authenticate the Biblical discrepancies."

My intention is to look at the passage once more and to do it *sine ira et studio*. Gal. 3:17 is a difficult passage, and our spending some time over it is certainly justified. To begin with, let me state that my position is that the Scriptures have come to us in human language and that the holy writers follow the laws of human thought and speech which are in vogue among us; if they did not do this, we could not understand them. This implies that I have no right to make them say something which the words evidently do not signify. But it implies, too, that I have no right to refuse the holy writers the freedom of expression, of easy and popular utterance and presentation which we claim as a prerogative for ourselves when we take to writing and speaking.

Now let me turn to Gal. 3:17. Paul is engaged in arguing the case of faith in Jesus Christ versus the view of the Judaizers that to be saved the Jewish Ceremonial Law had to be kept. He in Gal. 3:6 ff. had referred to the faith of Abraham. Now he reverts to the old patriarch. In v. 15 he lays down the general principle: When a covenant is made, duly acknowledged, and ratified,

no one has a right to annul it or to make additions; that is true even when we speak of merely human covenants. The implication is that it is all the more true when we are dealing with the promise of God. Now let us remember, says the Apostle in v. 16, as it were, God made a covenant with Abraham and his Seed, He gave sacred promises. Parenthetically he states that the sacred narrative advisedly uses the singular "Seed" and not the plural, the singular signifying Christ. Was that covenant bound to stand? Was it amended? It might be thought that the Law of Moses was an amendment to the covenant between God and Abraham. That view, says Paul in v. 17, is untenable. The promise was duly given and ratified, the Law has nothing to do with it, the Law is an altogether distinct matter, and that such is the case is very plain when one considers that it was given 430 years later. Hence it is absolutely impossible to consider the Law as a part of the covenant. We have to agree with the Apostle, his argument is absolutely convincing. The covenant made by God with Abraham and his Seed was a Gospel, not a Law covenant. Let all poor sinners rejoice over that truth.

We are now concerned with the assertion of Paul that the Law, evidently the Mosaic Law, was given 430 years later than the promises. It is that chronological note which troubles. If one follows the Hebrew text and figures from the time that Abraham received the promise, when he was seventy-five years old (Gen. 12:4), to the Exodus, the number of years is 645. This is a fact which Paul must have known very well, because he had carefully studied the Hebrew Scriptures. Still he says the interval was 430 years. There are some scholars who think that Paul is following the Septuagint, which in Ex. 12:40 says that the time which Israel spent in Egypt *and in the land of Canaan* was 430 years. If the reading should be correct, the time from the giving of the promise and the promulgation of the Mosaic Law would be 430 years. Since Paul was acquainted not only with the Hebrew Bible, but with the Septuagint, too, one can understand why many scholars hold that Paul has this Septuagint passage in mind when he writes Gal. 3:17. That reading implies that the sojourn of Israel in Egypt lasted 215 years, the same number of years that the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob had lived in Canaan (Abraham lived in Canaan 25 years before the birth of Isaac, Isaac was 60 years old when Jacob was born, Jacob was 130 when he left Canaan). But acceptance of the view that Paul follows the Septuagint raises difficulties. In Gen. 15:13 God says to Abraham: "Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them 400 years." The same words are quoted by Stephen, Acts 7:6. In other words, according to Gen. 15:13 the sojourn of Israel in Egypt lasted 400 years. That would agree with the statement that Israel was in Egypt 430 years, the latter being the accurate number of years, while 400 is a round figure. But to assume that the

sojourn lasted only 215 years would hardly be consonant with the statement that it had a duration of 400 years. Besides, the time of 215 years seems rather too brief for the growth of Israel into the strong nation which it was at the Exodus (cf. Ex. 12:37). For that reason, apart from other considerations, it seems preferable to me not to regard the Septuagint text for Ex. 12:40 as authentic, but to stay with the Hebrew text. It is true that from the first time that God gave the promise to Abraham to the giving of the Law, the span of time amounts to 645 years. But must we necessarily think of the first time when God gave the promise to Abraham? Is it really out of the question to think of the promises to the patriarchs as a unit and to assume that Paul in our text is thinking of them as a whole? The time of the patriarchs was definitely the era of the promises. God's gracious assurances with respect to the future of Israel were given not only to Abraham, but to Isaac and Jacob too. During 215 years these promises were uttered and repeated. Can anything valid be opposed to the view that Paul might be thinking of this era and that when thinking of the interval between the giving of the promise and the issuing of the Law, he computes the number of years not from the beginning of the era of the promises, but from the conclusion, especially since the Scriptures themselves have definitely stated the number of years involved? The question is, What is the *terminus a quo*? Grotius said that the journey of Jacob to Egypt was the point at which the reckoning has to commence. Olshausen advocates the same view. Hofmann agrees, saying that the *terminus a quo* is the time at which the promises were always rehearsed, that is, by the descendants of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Hauck and Lange take the same view. When we are dealing with events which form a series, a statement having to do with the amount of time that has elapsed since that series of events occurred may point to the beginning of the series or to the end of it. How many years after the Revolutionary War was Washington elected President? Quite likely you would figure from the end of the war, 1783. But would you be very critical of a friend who made 1776 the starting point, the *terminus a quo*? Let us put down this sentence: x years after Columbus, De Soto discovered the Mississippi River in 1541. What value will you give to x ? Many of my readers will at once think of 1492 and subtract that number from 1541. Others, a little more cautious, would say that the *terminus a quo* probably should be the fourth, or last, voyage of Columbus to America, which was undertaken in 1502. Others again would say that according to their view the year of the death of Columbus, 1506, is the one that one would have to think of in this connection. Is there any one of us who would say that only one of the three values given x would be permissible in this case and that whoever took a different position was violating the language of the statement?

Lenski, interestingly enough, voices the thought that Paul

mentions 430 years as a low figure, which he could have made higher; he presents an understatement, which, under the circumstances, had to be all the more effective. No one can deny that the Law came 430 years later; it could easily be proved that more years had elapsed, because the years spent by the patriarchs in Canaan could have been added. — Similarly one could say: Whether the Hebrew or the Septuagint text for the passage is right, the time between the giving of the promises and the promulgation of the Law was at least 430 years — a number which had to set at rest any notion that the Law might be considered a mere addition to the covenant of promises.

This discussion has become somewhat lengthy, but I hold that it is very evident that in fairness no one can accuse Paul of an inaccuracy when he says that the Law was given 430 years after the promises.

W. ARNDT



Theological Observer

Lutheranism or Pseudo-Lutheranism.—Replying in the *Lutheran Outlook* of March to some criticisms of his December *Lutheran Outlook* article by Dr. Arndt (cf. C. T. M. for February), Pastor Neve writes (quoted in part): "Dr. A. approaches the Bible with a formulated theory of inspiration, and he tries to make the Bible fit his theory. There is a peculiar twist of reasoning in his exegesis of the Scripture passages in question in order to arrive at a desired conclusion." Pastor Neve next endeavors to refute Dr. Arndt's illustration of how the Scriptures were written by God's penmen and attempts to show that there are "glaring inaccuracies" in the Bible. He then proceeds: "Dr. A. is more concerned about the vessel than he is about the treasure in the vessel. As God used an imperfect and sinful woman to bring the Perfect One, Jesus Christ, into the world, so He uses the Bible with its imperfections [*sic?*] to bring Jesus Christ Himself into the hearts of men. And that Christ who reveals Himself to man, beckons his soul so that he dares flee into His bosom of redeeming love. Christian faith is not so many postulates and theses which man must subscribe to with his intellect. Christian faith is the activity of God in coming to man through Jesus Christ and offering him full redemption and man's response to that gracious offer of salvation. And Christian faith is not a finished product. God's activity is a continuous activity toward and in man and man's continuous response to God by repentance and faith in His redeeming love which will not let him go. Dr. A. says that the doctrine of inspiration divides Lutherans. What is the Lutheran doctrine of inspiration? It is very obvious that Dr. A. wants us to draw the conclusion that his view is the Lutheran view of inspiration, and that there can be no unity of Lutherans before all Lutherans accept his view of inspiration." Pastor Neve now quotes several statements from Luther and remarks on them: "It is very clear from these quotations that Luther did not teach verbal inspiration of the Bible. But it is very clear that he teaches that the Word of God is inspired. By implication Dr. A. raises the question of scholasticism. It resolves itself into the question whether true Lutheranism or scholasticism shall prevail in the Lutheran Church. Scholasticism has been a hard taskmaster for the Church to fight. Luther's great work was to deliver the Church from scholasticism. He restored the Gospel to its rightful place in the Church. But after his death theology gradually slid back into scholasticism. Often it comes in the cloak of pure doctrine. Scholasticism attempts to define every phase of the Christian faith in postulates and theses which must be accepted with the intellect in order to be classified as a conservative Lutheran. Kierkegaard ridiculed such attempts to define Christian faith. Fortunately for the Lutheran Church, men have appeared on the scene who could dis-

tinguish between true Lutheranism and scholasticism." Pastor Neve here refers to Grundtvig, Kierkegaard, Peder Madsen, Eduard Geismar of Denmark, as also to Soederblom of Sweden, and then continues: "Their theology is based on the thoughts derived from their exhaustive Luther research. I ask in all sincerity: Are men that build their theology on Luther's writings liberals? And scholasticism is questionable Lutheranism. Are men that build their theology on the principles of scholasticism conservative Lutherans? Those that go back to Luther and through him to the Word of God are the true Lutherans. But those that build their theology on the concepts of scholasticism should be called pseudo-Lutherans. I have a great admiration for the Missouri Synod; she has done a great work for the Lord. But she would do still greater things for the Lord if she would rid herself of the remnants of scholasticism which honeycombs her theological thinking." — There is no doubt that Pastor Neve is sincere in his views, but the question is: Is he fair to Dr. Arndt, to the Bible, to Luther, and to what he condemns in our Church as scholasticism? Dr. Arndt certainly does not approach the Bible with a "formulated theory of inspiration, trying to make the Bible fit his theory," but, as the reader may judge from his article, he bases on clear Bible passages the doctrine concerning Biblical inspiration which he defends, passages which certainly Pastor Neve also studied. Why speak of a "formulated theory of inspiration of the Bible" when Biblical inspiration is a clear doctrine taught in Scripture? Again, do the "glaring inaccuracies," of which Pastor Neve speaks, really exist? Certainly the statements in Num. 25:9 and in 1 Cor. 10:8 are not "glaring inaccuracies" as everyone should know who has studied these texts. Furthermore, faith certainly rests upon the Gospel truths, just as the Gospel is the means by which faith is engendered (Rom. 10:17). Or would perhaps Pastor Neve discard the Apostles' Creed with its sacred Gospel "postulates and theses"? The doctrine of inspiration, moreover, does divide Lutheranism, for while some assert it, others deny it, and the twain do not meet. Nor is it fair to cite a few quotations from Luther, in which he expresses himself in terms that may be interpreted in various ways, against those clear and emphatic statements in which the Reformer does teach inspiration, and indeed verbal inspiration, though he does not use that term. An important book on Luther and his doctrine of Biblical inspiration is *Luther and the Scriptures* by the late eminent theologian Dr. M. Reu of the American Lutheran Church. In it Dr. Reu proves some very remarkable theses concerning Luther's doctrine of the Scriptures, as, for example, that the Scriptures were and always remained Luther's sole authority of doctrine and life, that Luther held that there was no error in Scripture, and so forth. On p. 63 Pastor Neve may read Luther's expressions: "So we refer all of Scripture to the Holy Ghost"; and: "Holy Scripture has been spoken by the Holy Ghost," which Dr. Reu purposely underscored. On page 81 Dr. Reu pub-

lishes the judgment of the great German theologian Wilhelm Walther "that an inaccuracy in the Scriptural accounts is not admitted," in which opinion Dr. Reu concurs, as he explicitly states. We wish that we Lutherans would study this fine and useful book; it is in full agreement with what Dr. Arndt says in his article. Again, if it is scholasticism to formulate in clear statements what Scripture teaches, so as to present the various doctrines of God's Word in a lucid overview, then by all means let us have "scholasticism" and much more of it. But such was not the "scholasticism" of Mynster, Martensen, and Soederblom in their departures from Scripture. Their errors rather were due to a lack of the right Christian "scholasticism." Then, too, let us not forget that much of what is called "Luther research" is not that at all, but rather a perversion of Luther's statements and a twisting of his words. It is well known that Unitarian liberals quote Luther as much as do orthodox Lutherans, and when you deal with Seventh-Day Adventists and Mormons, they, too, desire to prove their unscriptural teachings from Luther. The writer finally expresses great admiration for the Missouri Synod, but calls upon it to get rid of its "scholasticism." If faithful adherence to clear teachings of Scripture must go by the name of "scholasticism," then let us frankly state that it was Missouri's scholasticism that helped her, by God's grace, "do great things for the Lord." A Church is as strong as is its adherence to the Word; if it yields the divine Word, it loses its strength and joy in the Lord's work, for, as Luther says: "Where the Word of God is not [found], there is not true knowledge of God, but only ignorance, delusion, and erroneous opinion concerning God" (St. Louis Ed., III:1412); and again: "We should be bound to the divine Word. That we should hear, and no one should teach us anything without the Word of God out of his mind" (St. Louis Ed., III:1667). J. T. M.

"Lutheran Church Quarterly."—A stately new periodical, a quarterly, appears on the scene of the Lutheran Church in America. In it are merged the *Lutheran Church Quarterly*, published by the faculties of Gettysburg and Mt. Airy Seminaries (U. L. C. A.), and the *Augustana Quarterly* (Augustana Synod). The new publication is sponsored by the following seminaries: Mt. Airy, Gettysburg, Capital, Wartburg, Luther, and Augustana. The aims of the journal are stated thus (p. 70): "The aims of this quarterly shall be to provide a forum (1) for the discussion of Christian faith and life on the basis of the Lutheran confession, (2) for the application of the principles of the Lutheran Church to the changing problems of religion and society, (3) for the fostering of world Lutheranism, and (4) for the promotion of understanding between Lutherans and other Christians." The policy of the new quarterly is defined in these words: "The Editors will welcome contributions that are likely to be helpful in the furtherance of the aims set forth above. It will be required of such contributions that they be frank and fair in their discussion of moot questions; that they

be free from controversial animus; and that their contents be of real scholarly and practical value to the readers. Difference of opinion between contributors, or between a contributor and the editors, does not of itself exclude articles from publication, since the editors do not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of contributors." The editorial staff consists of the following professors: Editor, Dr. Conrad Bergendoff; Managing Editor, Prof. Theodore Liefeld; Book Review Editor, Dr. Theodore Tappert; Business Manager, Dr. Andrew Burgess. The price of the journal is \$2.50 a year, to be paid in advance. The price of a single copy is 75 cents. It is evident that the periodical is conceived of as an open forum in which the questions of common interest to all Lutherans, especially those requiring scholarly research, can be aired and surveyed. We hope that in these days of confusion and strife the new periodical will bring many a Scriptural, wholesome, cheering, faith-strengthening message to its readers and help to build the Lutheran Zion here in America. The table of contents for the first number should be submitted here: "Foreward" (Conrad Bergendoff); "Amsterdam: a Symposium" (A. R. Wentz, H. L. Yochum, E. L. Ryden); "Blessings in the Church of Germany" (J. Bodensieck); "The New Crisis in American Lutheran Theology" (Charles W. Kegley); "The Common Liturgy" (Luther D. Reed); "Christianity and the Church College" (O. P. Kretzmann); "Notes and Studies"; "Book Reviews"; "Books Received." A.

On Recent Luther Research.—In the section of the new *Lutheran Quarterly* which is called "Notes and Studies" there appears an article which we wish very much every reader of the CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY could peruse. It has the title "Some Questions Concerning Recent Luther Research" and is written by Uuras Saarnivaara, whose position is that of "Instructor of Systematic and Exegetical Theology at Suomi Theological Seminary in Hancock, Michigan." Several years ago we had the pleasure of reading his scholarly dissertation on Luther's teaching on Justification and Sanctification—a very penetrating and valuable study. It is evident that Dr. Saarnivaara has devoted much time to Luther research. The main point in the little article appearing in the *Lutheran Quarterly* is that modern scholars have paid too much attention to what was written by the young Luther and in a one-sided way were led to neglect what was written by the Reformer in the years of maturity. It was especially Karl Holl who, according to our author, was guilty in this respect. Dr. Saarnivaara says: "There are several theologians who feel that Karl Holl, influenced by Albrecht Ritschl, 'ethicized' Luther's teaching by giving the ethical or moral too central a place. In reality, the true center of Luther's faith was occupied by the religious relationship of man to God. This ethical point of view exerted a particularly detrimental influence on Holl's interpretation of Luther's doctrine of justification. He stated that according to Luther God's act of justification has its basis in man's renewal or sanc-

tification. This renewal is effected by the grace of God. Since God has determined to perfect this renewal, He regards or reckons it as already complete, thus 'imputing' or reckoning to man a righteousness, although it is as yet in a state of becoming. Man is not justified by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, but by the renewal of sanctification. The actual basis of the divine judgment which justifies is not the merit of Christ, but the renewal of man (Holl, *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, III, pp. 530 ff.). Holl's interpretation of Luther occasioned a far-flung theological controversy, which resulted in some light being thrown on the question of Luther's doctrine of justification and sanctification."

Next, our author speaks of the influence of Luther on Karl Barth. Here, too, some investigators think they find that it was especially the young Luther who helped to shape the thought of Barth. Continuing, Dr. Saarnivaara protests especially against the view that the teachings in the writings of the mature Luther, which are divergent from those of his early works, are classified as "Melanchthonian." We have to distinguish clearly, says our author, between the pre-Reformation and the Reformation teachings of Luther. Where was the dividing line? Dr. Saarnivaara says: "Luther himself states that through the help of Staupitz, soon after his becoming a doctor of theology, he was able to believe in the forgiveness of sins, but he did not discover the evangelical insight into justification until the late fall of 1518. Our finding is that the evangelical conception of justification is not found in Luther's writings and lectures before the fall of 1518." It will be seen from these remarks that Dr. Saarnivaara dates the famous "tower experience" of Luther not before 1517, as it is so often done, but in the late fall of 1518, a dating which agrees with what Luther in 1545, when he wrote an introduction to his collected Latin works, says on this subject.

A.

Whither Lutheran Theology in America? — In the new journal *The Lutheran Quarterly* an article by Prof. Charles W. Kegley of Chicago Lutheran Theological Seminary, Maywood, Ill., is published which has the caption "New Crisis in American Lutheran Theology." Whoever wishes to inform himself on current theological thinking in the world as seen from the Lutheran point of view is advised to read this article. Dr. Kegley surveys the theological scene at home and abroad and classifies the chief phenomena. What he sets forth elicits these remarks from us. There are two great movements in present-day theological thinking that woo those who study theology in a special, systematic way, modernism and neo-orthodoxy. Modernism is the type of theology represented, for instance, by Fosdick, Shailer Matthews, and Wieman. It is man-centered, man's intellect is made the arbiter of what is true and what is false; the brief creed that results is altogether a rationalistic product. The neo-orthodoxy theologians, led by Barth and Brunner abroad and Reinhold Niebuhr in the United States, insist that a divine revelation has taken place to which man must

listen. But while it bitterly contends against a self-confident modernism with its hollow optimism, it shares some of the positions of the enemy; for instance, those that have to do with Higher Criticism, the negative conclusions as to the authenticity of a number of books of the Scriptures and the inerrancy of the Bible. There is a third group of theologians, called Fundamentalists, whose positions, resulting largely from a literalistic interpretation of the Scriptures, the Lutheran theologian cannot accept *in toto*. It seems that many Lutheran scholars here in America incline toward neo-orthodoxy. Professor Kegley does not. He rejoices to see that the Lutheran World Federation has been founded, he says, and Lutheran thinking, he believes, will be stimulated. What will it produce? Will a new Lutheran theology result? What should be its character?

Without sharing all the analyses of Dr. Kegley, we wish to say that we have read his article with delight and profit. The fear that many Lutheran theologians seem to entertain that loyalty to the Confessions will simply lead to a theology of sterile repristination, we do not consider justified. Is it really necessary for theology, if it is to be live and active, to produce new systems, to construct new edifices of thought that are different from those of the Fathers? Luther, it must be admitted, so it seems at least to this writer, did not produce anything new in the line of doctrine. His theology was in its fundamental tenets that of the early church councils, and its driving force was the teaching of justification by grace through faith, taught especially by the Apostle Paul. This doctrine had become obscured and almost lost in the bewildering mazes of scholastic speculations. Luther rediscovered it through his study of the Scriptures. How can we desire to go beyond these positions if we really accept the Scriptures as divine, Christ as our all-sufficient Savior, the doctrine of justification by grace through faith as the central teaching of God's revelation? To proclaim the saving truth of the Gospel to poor sinners will, of course, not bring anybody fame as a profound original thinker, but it will do something far better, it will lead thirsty souls to the fountains where spring the waters of everlasting life, and it will extend the gracious rule of God's kingdom. Incidentally, is a person not here reminded of the position taken by the old Lutheran theologians that theology is a *habitus practicus theosdotos*? Lutheran theology, as the Fathers thought of it, must have practical aims, its objective must be to lead sinners to Christ, its work must be done *sub specie aeternitatis*. Not speculative wisdom, but the Cross of Christ must be its glory. Were they wrong? A.

Is Separation Right? — Recently there have appeared several articles in the *Lutheran Companion* which concern themselves with this topic. One of them is found in the issue of January 12, in "The Spectator" columns, and reads thus: "The Lutheran World Federation was right in insisting that membership in the World Council of Churches should be on a denominational rather than a

national basis. That means that the World Council recognizes as fact that there are different denominations in Protestantism today. The Spectator is glad that the interdenominational enthusiasts from America were overruled on this point. There is a difference between the teachings and practices of the Congregational and the Lutheran Churches, for example. To deny this is a falsehood, and to ignore it is cowardice. However, we agree with the World Council that, after recognizing differences, the denominations can and ought to work together for the common good insofar as they possibly can do so. Thus we recognize the principles of freedom and truth and love. Because of this decision, despite disappointing omissions and weaknesses, we believe that the World Council has started 'on the right foot,' far more so than the United Nations. But, of course, the Spectator is not omniscient. Neither were the fortunate few who made history in Amsterdam."

The other one appeared in the December 29, 1948, issue in an article written by Dr. Conrad Bergendoff, president of Augustana College, in a report on the Federal Council meeting early in December. The article has the title "Federal Council Observes 40th Birthday." After having stated that a commission on the "Witness of the Church in Our Time" had rendered a report which was enthusiastically received and after quoting from this report to the effect that if the Church is to do its work it must have the Holy Spirit today, Dr. Bergendoff continues: "As further proof, if any be needed, of the doctrinal ground on which the Council stands, it may be mentioned that a request had been made of the Council to make clear if the Federal Council agreed with the doctrinal article of the World Council. The latter defines Christ as 'God and Saviour.' In 1942 the Executive Committee had gone on record as interpreting the Federal Council's constitution as meaning exactly what the World Council's statement said. Now in 1948 the whole Federal Council assembled in convention voted that it agreed with the definition in the World Council's constitution."

"This action and the statement quoted above should be pondered by those who question the Christian faith of those who would make the Federal Council a real force for winning America for Christ. Of course, there are different ideas of what the Church is or should be. But this is a Council of *Churches*, and each has the right to witness to the truth as it has been persuaded. No one questions this right, but we may well question the right of any group to say that all others than itself are wrong, and so to have nothing to do with others. True Christianity can recognize the rights of others as well as one's own, and Christ's example is not on the side of those who make themselves the measure of the faith of all."

May we be permitted to add a few comments. The fact that a church body is small and that the great majority of Christians

in the church take a different position from the one it holds should indeed induce all the members of that small body to examine their course carefully, but does not by itself prove that they are in error. Roman Catholics are more numerous than Protestants, but no Protestant will admit that this superiority in numbers shows that Protestantism is wrong and Roman Catholicism right. There are far more non-Christians in the world than Christians, but this is no evidence for the correctness of the position held by the non-Christians. Furthermore, aloofness may be wrong: it is wrong when it proceeds from a spirit of stubbornness, self-righteous Pharisaism, spiritual pride, or something else of that category. But just as emphatically we have to say that the truth must be loved and upheld, and no alliances must be formed through which error would be sanctioned and God's revelation be negated. It is true that there is a borderland here, a sort of penumbra, where doubt may arise whether the one course should be followed or the other, and we hold that in such cases the message of 1 Corinthians 13 must not be overlooked; but as to the general duty of Christians, who love the Gospel of Jesus Christ and would like to see it remain unimpaired, to be witnesses of the truth, contend for it, and rather to undergo the pains of separation than to give tacit approval to its being crushed, there can be no doubt.

A.

Frankly and Honestly Admitting Differences of Opinion.—In *Theology Today* (January, 1949), in his special department "Theological Table-Talk," Dr. H. T. Kerr, Jr., calls attention to the fact that the "National Conference of Christians and Jews, Inc." has for some years sponsored a Religious Book Week. Representatives of Protestantism, Roman Catholicism, and Jewry are invited to submit lists of books which are calculated to further the cause of mutual understanding. The last week of October marked the sixth annual observance of Religious Book Week. Unfortunately, as Dr. Kerr adds, the committees which selected the books were subject to a higher censorship so that a list could be prepared which would not offend Protestant, Catholic, or Jews. Thus a book, which had been sold in more than 20,000 copies since it was first published, was found unacceptable to the Roman Catholics, and it was accordingly dropped. This fact induced Dr. Kerr to add a paragraph which might be considered by all denominations that consider better relations.

He writes: "Something might be gained for the goal of the National Conference if it would frankly and honestly admit that there is on many points a difference of opinion among Protestants, Catholics, and Jews. It might indeed be a good thing if a Religious Book Week in the near future were devoted to books which speak in a forthright way of the distinctive features of the three faiths, so that all could see where the conflicts are as well as the possible compromises. Respect for real differences of opinion may well lead to a deeper unity. In any event, there is

little hope of establishing a firm foundation among the three faiths by striking a dead level which obscures real antagonism. The democratic process is not furthered by avoidance of differences, catering to the fear of being offended, vaunting a misleading and superficial comity, or censorship."

It is, of course, futile to expect Catholics, Protestants, and Jews ever to unite in a common faith, though they may at times join in syncretistic worship, which, however, is opposed to the very fundamentals of their confessional principles. But coming nearer home, we may well apply what Dr. Kerr says to the various Lutheran denominations in our country. Let no one assume that differences in doctrine and practice no longer exist among them. The published doctrinal declarations indeed strike a refreshing note of conservative unity. But deviations from the official doctrinal declarations do occur distressingly often, and frequently, too, the denominational practice is in accord with neither Scripture nor the Lutheran Confessions. Here, then, also "something might be gained for the goal of unity if the denominations would frankly and honestly admit that there is on many points a difference of opinion." And here, too, Dr. Kerr's remark obtains: "There is little hope of establishing a firm foundation by striking a dead level which obscures real antagonism. The democratic process is not furthered by avoidance of differences, catering to the fear of being offended." Lutherans, desiring true church unity, should certainly welcome frank and honest discussion of doctrinal and other differences.

J. T. M.

Describes Life of Missionary in Communist-Held China.—

A detailed picture of what life is like for a missionary in Communist-held territory is contained in a series of letters brought by messenger to mission headquarters in Shanghai. At the request of mission headquarters, the name of the writer and his whereabouts is withheld.

The mission has a hospital and two schools—a primary school and a junior middle school. The hospital has been run uninterruptedly since the changeover. The schools have recently reopened after the mid-winter holiday.

Communist authorities who called to investigate the hospital refused to take tea and indulged in none of the pleasantries with which official visits usually begin in China. They got straight to the point and asked a series of questions as to the size of the staff, salaries paid, how medicines were obtained, how much money was received each month, how deficits were made up, and the location of mission headquarters in China.

"We answered frankly and freely," writes the missionary, "and in answer to the question, 'What is your object in running this hospital?' we got in a little propaganda of our own. We told them, 'We also are here to liberate the people: the sick by healing, the illiterate by education, and those shackled by superstition, by the Gospel of God.'"

The missionary took advantage of the visit to ask the officials if they could do anything to stop sight-seeing soldiers from over-running the hospital. (The missionary explains in his letter that the soldiers, most of them country boys, came in a spirit of curiosity and had even invaded the operating room during an operation.) The answer to the missionary's plea was unusual, but effective.

A day or two later, a group of soldiers were drawn up in front of the hospital. The officer in charge instructed them to inspect the hospital thoroughly, as this would be their last chance. They were asked not to force locked doors or enter the operating room, "as it might be harmful to the patient." Then the soldiers swarmed over the hospital, looking at everything, for a period of two and a half hours. They have not returned since.

When the mission schools were re-opened, Communist authorities banned the teaching of religion and ordered that the Boy Scout troop be dissolved. Students petitioned for religious teaching after school hours, and such teaching is being given. English teaching has been dropped in the primary school by orders of the authorities. In the junior middle English classes have been cut from six hours weekly to three.

Churches have been little affected by the changeover. At evangelistic services held on Chinese New Year's Day, the churches were thronged, and some Communist officials were among those who attended. Officials simply inform pastors that church buildings will be used at a specified hour for public meetings, but this has caused no difficulty except in one instance.

When told that a church was wanted for a meeting on Sunday morning, the Chinese pastor informed the authorities that it was not available because church services were to be held. His firmness won him his point.

Economic conditions were hard at first; prices were high and commodities scarce. Later, as Communist currency became plentiful, the situation eased somewhat. "Our sewing project is booming, our garments selling like hotcakes," reports the missionary. Merchants are traveling back and forth between Nationalist and Communist territory without hindrance. Prices are fixed daily at a conference between the merchants and the Chamber of Commerce.

Postal service with the Nationalist territory has been resumed, and letters were received three times in a single week. In his last letter, however, the missionary notes that there was some hitch in the postal arrangement, and no letters had been received for some days.

Anti-Americanism is stressed at public meetings, he reports, but on the other hand, the mission receives a stream of visitors, most of them soldiers, asking "thousands" of questions about the United States. The great number of visitors seemed trying, at first, but the missionary realized it was an opportunity and now sits down with them and tries to tell them all they want to know.

Of general conditions, he notes that officials dress as simply as anyone else; no one is called a "servant" any more; soldiers wear no insignia of any kind; foreign goods are almost nonexistent. In this area, the Army has no automotive vehicles of any kind. A hammer and sickle flag is used at party meetings, but at other meetings the flag of the Republic of China is displayed.

The missionary observes that Communist military progress is well ahead of civil organization, and that civil officers must work hard to catch up. Communist officials do not oppress or brow-beat the people, he says, "but there is still a great deal of distress that they do nothing about."

On the whole, the letters are optimistic and hopeful. With twenty-five years' experience with the Chinese behind him, the missionary wonders "if Marxism won't undergo a change in China." [The item is passed on for what it is worth. If the optimism it breathes should prove to be justified by conditions in more areas than one, we shall be happy. A.] RNS

Curious Trends in Israel. — Under this heading the *Intelligence Digest* (March 1, 1949), published in London, in discussing world events, has the following to say: "Finally, we are told on very high Jewish authority that nearly *all* the Jewish theologians are convinced that the Messianic age is about to begin, and this conviction is going to spread and create a force, the power of which may prove immense . . . we venture a further revolutionary view: There are reasons for believing that Israel will shortly be converted to Christianity. The result might prove comparable to the conversion of Rome. One of the most important experts on this question in the world told us the other day that 1) Israel will adopt Christianity within a measurable time; 2) Britain will make an alliance with Israel; 3) The Middle East will become almost entirely westernized after incredible changes." We know that this is the hope of those who believe in the final conversion of "all Israel," but it struck us as strange to find it in the *Intelligence Digest*. The reports in the daily press do not confirm the belief here voiced. There are indeed orthodox Jews in Israel, but the great majority are Reform Jews who no longer believe in what the Prophets say. Zionism is largely a secular and not a religious movement. J. T. M.

Text of "Declaration on Religious Freedom." — Text of the Declaration on Religious Freedom adopted in New York by the executive committee of the Federal Council of Churches follows: The evidence coming from several areas in Europe makes it clear that there is a systematic attack upon churches by Communist-controlled governments. Although there may be no overt persecution of Christians for the profession of their private faith or for religious worship, it is plain that totalitarian states under Communist domination are determined to prevent the Churches from having any influence in public life. In the light of recent developments in Hungary, Bulgaria, and elsewhere the design of these

states to bring the Churches into subservience is no longer open to doubt. The methods adopted by one totalitarian regime or another in achieving this design include preventing the Churches from maintaining schools for the religious education of their children, banning Christian youth movements or sharply circumscribing their activities, eliminating or controlling Christian publications, forcing strong church leaders out of their positions and supplanting them with submissive personalities, and isolating the Churches from fellowship and contact with Churches in other lands. While these objectives may not be openly avowed, they are pursued by such devious means as public trials on such technical charges as manipulating the currency, black marketing, and espionage. The attack of the Communist-controlled governments is directed against all forms of organized religion which refuse to be tools of a secular policy. All the Churches are involved in the defense of a rightful religious freedom as over against the pretensions of the totalitarian state. They must stand together in resisting, in such ways as are appropriate to the Church, every attempt of a godless political regime to curtail or to destroy the influence of religion.

In bearing this united testimony and standing together in a common protest we must guard against a blind emotion or a heedless hysteria which might seek to defend the Church through resort to war. It would be wholly illusory to suppose that the present tensions could be relaxed by such a method. Our witness in behalf of basic religious freedom is not limited to the states which are under Communist domination. There is also a totalitarianism of a Fascist type which is hostile to religious freedom. States which profess to be defending the rights of religion may in practice be denying those rights by their treatment of minority groups. We cannot be silent about the fact that in Spain, the Argentine, and elsewhere there are today grievous abridgments of religious freedom. In championing religious freedom we mean freedom from coercion by any earthly power, whether political or ecclesiastical, that assumes the prerogative of God and attempts to control the conscience of the individual. We do not know the facts of the situation in the Communist-controlled countries well enough to justify us in fully evaluating the acts of our Christian brethren who are passing through a terrible ordeal. We can, however, have a confident trust that in every country there will be a faithful remnant who under all circumstances of conflict will choose to obey God rather than men and who will not compromise their Christian convictions.

It is out of such fidelity to the Word of God in the face of hardship and danger that the Christian Church in other ages has survived attack and had its spiritual vitality renewed. The greatest service which we can render to hard-pressed Christians in many countries is to stand beside them in a fellowship of the spirit and to pray that they may be sustained by the Divine assurance that the faithfulness will not be in vain. The threat which

the Churches confront in other lands is a ringing call to Christians, in lands that are still free, to redouble their efforts in behalf of social justice and human rights. It is in the soil of misery and injustice that Communism thrives. For Christians to struggle constantly to establish both freedom and justice for all people, remembering especially the poorest and the most oppressed, is to strengthen the Church for its most effective witness in the world today.

RNS

Brief Items from *Religious News Service*

Protestants at Home

A national Go-To-Church Movement has been launched in Los Angeles by a group of prominent businessmen and educators. Leaders of the movement, which is non-sectarian, announced they plan to use newspapers, magazines, radio, television, movies, and billboards to urge people to go to church. Gaylord D. Richmond, of the Los Angeles County Art Institute, executive director of the movement, said it was undertaken because of the large number of unchurched adults and youth in the country. "The Go-To-Church Movement," he said, "plans to sell religion back to the American people through a national advertising campaign on a year-round basis."

Some 400 Protestant leaders from the United States and Latin America convened in San Juan, Puerto Rico, to take part in a three-day celebration March 11—13, commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of Protestant mission work in Puerto Rico. In connection with the anniversary observances, Puerto Rican Methodists, Presbyterians, Disciples of Christ, and Baptists celebrated their annual conventions. A mass meeting of Protestants of all denominations held on Sunday, March 13, at the huge Sixto Escobar Ballpark climaxed the celebration. Churches from seventy-seven Puerto Rican municipalities took part in the rally which paid homage to Antonio Badillo Hernandez, who in 1860 became the first Puerto Rican converted to Protestantism.

The Western Section of the Alliance of Reformed Churches Holding the Presbyterian System, at its 3-day meeting in Buck Hill Falls, Pa., took a firm stand in favor of religious freedom throughout the world. The Section, representing 8 Reformed and Presbyterian communions in North America and Mexico, noted that the "sacred principle" of religious freedom had been "invaded by political and ecclesiastical despotism." It expressed "its grave concern" on five situations involving religious freedom: 1) The "growing pressure to divert federal funds to parochial schools"; 2) the "New Mexico public school controversy in which a Protestant group is charging that Catholicism is taught in the public school system"; 3) the "banning of certain periodicals of national reputation from public and school libraries in the United States"; 4) the "systematic persecution of Protestant Christians in Spain both by civil and religious authorities and the growing infringe-

ments on religious liberty and active religious persecutions in Mexico and certain nations of South America"; 5) efforts to effect the recognition of "Fascist Spain and similar situations which tend to deny Christian liberty." The delegates directed the executive committee of the Section to "appoint a vigorous sub-committee, headed by President John A. Mackay of the Princeton Theological Seminary, to make a thorough study of this whole situation" for consideration at next year's session.

Two more Southern California Baptist elementary schools will be added next September to six similar schools now in operation by the denomination.

Protestants Abroad

A Protestant theological seminary will be established in Yugoslavia for the first time according to information received in New York by the National Lutheran Council. The Rev. Franjo Sostarec, superintendent of the Hungarian Lutheran Church in Yugoslavia, notified the Council he will open the seminary in August in Subotica in the District of Backa in Vojvodina Province. Facilities of the seminary will be available to ministerial candidates of all Protestant denominations, although most seminarians will belong to the four national groups in the Lutheran Church in Yugoslavia. These are the Hungarian Lutheran Church, the Slovak Lutheran Church, the Wendish (Slovene) Lutheran Church, and the Croatian Lutheran Church.

Celebrations marking the 100th anniversary of the arrival of the first Church of England clergymen in Sweden were held at the English Church in Stockholm. Among those attending were Dr. Manfred Bjoerkquist, Lutheran bishop of Stockholm, Crown Princess Louise, and the British ambassador.

Oxford University has been given an endowment of 42,000 pounds (about \$168,000) for professorship of Eastern religion and ethics, intended to promote interest in the religions and ethical systems of the East.

An announcement that "we are making progress" has been the only official word received from a thirty-man joint committee of clergymen and laymen meeting in Toronto to discuss reunion of the Church of England in Canada and the United Church of Canada. Reunion negotiations began in 1943 when the General Synod of the Church of England invited other religious bodies to discuss the possibility of such action. The United Church accepted, but the Presbyterians, Baptists, and other Protestant denominations declined the invitation.

Miss Aileen Wade of Belfast has been named superintendent of the Sunday School by Post which is conducted in Kenya, East Africa, by the Irish Auxiliary of the Colonial and Continental

Church Society in Belfast, Ireland. The school sends religious instruction by mail to children in Kenya, Uganda, Tanganyika, the Sudan, and Zanzibar.

The Methodist theological seminary at Gothenburg, Sweden, observed its 75th anniversary with week-long celebrations in which Methodist representatives from England, Germany, Norway, and Finland took part.

The faculty of Protestant theology at Strasbourg University has resumed publication of its *Review of Religious History and Philosophy*, which was forced to suspend at the outbreak of the war. Among items appearing in the current issue is a treatise on love of one's neighbor by Martin Buber (1491—1551), an outstanding Protestant reformer, which had not been published since the Reformation. Before the war, the *Review* was concerned mostly with historical erudition. It has now been widened in scope to give more space to articles on biblical scholarship and dogmatic and ethical theology.

Others

Religious broadcasts in Greece will, in the future, be controlled by the Holy Synod of the Orthodox Church, which has appointed a radio committee of three metropolitans. Appointment of the committee followed the banning, at the request of the Holy Synod, of a Sunday broadcast over the Athens radio station sponsored by the Oriental Missionary Society. The broadcast consisted of Bible readings, a sermon, and hymns sung by a young people's choir of the Greek Evangelical Church. *Enoria*, a religious weekly in Athens, commenting on the action of the Holy Synod, stressed that Sunday broadcasts were assuming "a completely Protestant color." — "It is the duty of the state church," it said, "to teach some foreigners as well as some Greek Protestants, who are happily only few, that Greek Orthodoxy is not a vineyard without a fence around it."

A bill calling for censorship of illustrated publications intended for children has been adopted by the French National Assembly. The measure provides that such publications put less emphasis on gangsterism, armed robberies, murders, etc. Heavy fines will be imposed on violators. This censorship power will be exercised by a special commission set up under the Ministry of Justice. The commission will comprise representatives of church and public school teachers, artists, publishers of children's books and magazines, and a mother and father chosen by the National Union of Family Associations.

Pope Pius XII may hasten his anticipated proclamation of the dogma of the Assumption. Some quarters consider it not unlikely that Pope Pius may decide to proclaim the dogma during the coming Holy Year of 1950, in view of developments in coun-

tries within the Soviet orbit. Catholic sources say that efforts inside Iron Curtain countries to create national churches which would have no link with the Vatican have made it more necessary than ever to affirm the supreme sovereignty of the Pope. This could be done most effectively, some Catholics feel, by a solemn proclamation of the Assumption doctrine. The dogma would be the first promulgated since 1870, when the Vatican Council proclaimed the infallibility of the Pope in matters of faith and morals.

Twelve Roman Catholic organizations and their branches, including women's and youth groups, have been closed in various parts of Romania by the government. All property of the organizations involved has been taken over by the government. The official gazette which made this report also stated that a Protestant women's organization with headquarters at Sibiu and a Jewish welfare society in Sacra had been liquidated.

Dr. Albert Schweitzer, who has given more than thirty years of his life to serving neglected negroes in French Equatorial Africa, will visit the United States in July. He will deliver a lecture in Colorado in connection with the 200th anniversary celebration of the birth of the German poet Goethe. This will be Dr. Schweitzer's only public engagement while in the United States.

The American Bible Society and the British Bible Society of Canada have sent 200,000 copies of the New Testament in modern Greek and in the old Greek language to members of the Greek army. Responsibility for distributing the Scriptures has been undertaken by the Welfare Service of the Army's General Staff.

Missionaries of the Church of Latter Day Saints in central and western New York recently held a meeting in Palmyra, New York, near the site of the church's origin, to discuss plans for the annual pageant, July 24, at Hill Cumorah, now a place of pilgrimage for Mormons from all parts of the world. Most of the missionaries are young college students who have enlisted for a two-year period of mission work without pay.

Book Review

All books reviewed in this periodical may be procured from or through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis 18, Mo.

The Protestant Dilemma. An Analysis of the Current Impasse in Theology. By Carl F. H. Henry. Wm. B. Eerdmans Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. 248 pages, 8×5½. \$3.00.

Dr. Carl F. H. Henry is now professor of Philosophy of Religion at Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, Calif., after having served the Northern Baptist Theological Seminary at Chicago in the same capacity and Gordon College Divinity School, Boston, and Wheaton College, Wheaton, Ill., as visiting professor. The theological background will help the reader to understand why Dr. Henry takes issue with modern naturalistic and supernaturalistic liberal theology. This is his third of a series of volumes on current philosophico-religious thought, the two former being *The Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism* (1947) and *Remaking the Modern Mind* (1948), and in it he discusses above all the liberal theology of Karl Barth, rendered popular in our country especially by Emil Brunner, whose works are now being widely read. His analysis of contemporary liberal thought is conducted under five heads: 1. "The Mid-Twentieth Century Impasse," an over-all picture of the problems involved in modern Liberalism; 2. "The Mid-Twentieth Century View of Revelation"; 3. "The Mid-Twentieth Century View of Sin"; 4. "The Mid-Twentieth Century View of Christ"; 5. "The Protestant Horizon," which is a review of the problems discussed. To these chapters is added an important Appendix, consisting of five brief, but timely discussions of special problems, e. g., "Calvin on the Word and the Spirit"; "Luther on the Word and the Spirit"; "The New Testament on the Word of God"; "Subjective and Objective Authority"; "W. M. Horton's Christology." The reader will no doubt find the "Index of Subjects" and the "Index of Persons" very helpful for review and special study. He will also thank the writer for his clear analysis and keen discernment of modern theological and philosophical thought. He quotes many Modernist, Barthian, conservative Reformed, and conservative Lutheran theologians (among these Drs. Engelder and Reu) and shows that he is well acquainted with Luther's theology, which usually (though not always) he presents accurately and correctly. He writes the book not primarily as a systematician, but as a student of the Philosophy of Religion who carefully dissects the errant views of modern Liberals and as a keen apologist who disclaims all pretenses of conceited reason and leads his readers right back to Scripture as the only authority in religion. This does not mean that the Lutheran reader will subscribe to every statement made in the book, but it does mean that after he has carefully studied it, he will thank Professor Henry for having cleared up in his mind the intangible falsities of modern Liberalism, which perhaps he has felt, but has been unable to define. The author's viewpoint is not that of a strict Fundamentalist, but rather that of a conservative evangelical believer whose theological taproots strike down deeply into solid Reformation soil. At times his juxtapositions seem a bit novel, as, for example, when he writes: "Liberalism often points out that there are many systems of Fundamentalism —

Plymouth Brethren, Missouri Lutherans, Wesleyan Methodists, Orthodox Presbyterians, and Northern Baptists" (p. 54). But then he goes on to show that conservative evangelical theology cannot be equated with Fundamentalism at all. While the writer's analyses of the modern liberal views of sin and of Christ (which he shows to be at variance with conservative evangelical theology) are indeed important, his discussion of the modern liberal view on revelation is perhaps the most weighty, for here he comes to grips with the major premise of liberal supernaturalism and so with the most burning of all present-day theological questions, the vital question of what revelation is and where and how it may be determined. He points out that both modern supernaturalism and modern naturalism, because of their false premises, cannot speak of having any revelation, while conservative evangelical theology, which accepts the Bible as God's inspired Word, or as God's inerrant objective Revelation, is in agreement with both Scripture and common sense. The reviewer believes that this is the simplest, clearest, and most convincing refutation of the Barth-Brunner liberal theology which so far has been presented within the reach of the average reader's intelligence and withal the most persuasive appeal to present-day evangelical theologians to go back to the traditional doctrine of Christianity concerning the authoritative Bible as the true, objective "Word of God" and the sole source and rule of faith and life. He therefore heartily recommends this book to his fellow pastors for private and conference study. It will help them to see the old faith in new glory and the new theological aberrations in the old sham of untruth and deceit.

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER

Notes on the New Testament, Explanatory and Practical. By Albert Barnes. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids 6, Mich. Vol. I (Matthew and Mark), 409 pages. Vol. II (Luke and John), 400 pages, 9×6. \$3.00 each.

Little did modest, scholarly Pastor Albert Barnes, Presbyterian minister in Philadelphia, Pa., think that when between 1832 and 1851 he published his *Notes on the Bible*, the first edition would be sold in more than five hundred copies and that subsequent editions would be read by millions of ministerial and lay students of the Bible, not only in English, but also in foreign languages of every sort, such as Welsh, French, Tamil, and scores of others. In other words, Barnes' *Notes* proved itself a best seller from the very beginning, and it is still a best seller today. The Bible student, therefore, owes the Baker Book House a hearty vote of thanks for getting out the *Notes* in this new enlarged-type edition, edited by Dr. Robert Frew, "with numerous additional notes and a series of engravings." The print is clear and so easily read, even the footnotes, which in former editions often were almost illegible on account of the small type that was used. There is no need to explain at any length the nature and purpose of Barnes' *Notes*. They were written primarily for Sunday school teachers and other church workers to enable them to expound the Bible successfully to children and adults. For this reason the *Notes* are simple, clear, brief, yet comprehensive, and quite to the point. At the end of each chapter there are added, under the title "Remarks," special lessons which apply the truths set forth in the text in a larger way to

present-day conditions. Very valuable also are the "Introductions" and "Prefaces," in which the author discusses essential *prolegomena* either of the whole Bible or else of special Bible books. We hope that the Baker Publishing House will succeed in putting out without too much delay the entire commentary of Barnes, including not only the New but also the Old Testament. We say this despite the fact that Mr. Barnes was a Reformed minister and his Calvinistic views are strongly reflected in many of his expositions. But this fact will enable the pastor to explain to his Bible students the doctrinal differences between the Reformed and the Lutherans, especially on the Sacraments, though on the whole the commentary is not aggressively controversial so far as Protestant teachings are concerned. The reviewer has used Barnes' *Notes* for years; and for all practical purposes, since Holy Scripture is essentially a perspicuous book, the average Bible student and teacher need no more than just such brief, practical, pithy notes as are offered in this commentary. The format is very handy for study, and the mechanical make-up of the book leaves nothing to be desired.

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER

In Understanding Be Men. By T. C. Hammond. The Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship, Chicago, Ill. 255 pages, 7½ × 5. \$2.00.

The "Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship" is a conservative, evangelical movement which fosters Christian indoctrination and profession among students in English-speaking countries. The subtitle of the volume before us is *A Handbook on Christian Doctrine for Non-Theological Students*. Its author is the Rev. T. C. Hammond, principal of Moore Theological College, Sydney, Australia, who also has written a number of other textbooks for the "Fellowship." The method of study used is the following: 1. An outline is presented of the main problems connected with each doctrine; 2. Then follow Scripture passages bearing on the doctrine; 3. Next come questions concerning the more important aspects of the subject; 4. Finally, there is a bibliography for further study of the doctrine. The viewpoint of the author is that of a moderate Reformed Fundamentalist, but the differing teachings of other denominations, such as the Catholic, the Lutheran, the Episcopal, etc., are also presented, though not always accurately and correctly. The books referred to in the Bibliographies are on the whole those of conservative divines, such as A. A. Hodge, James Orr, W. G. T. Shedd, H. R. Mackintosh, Bishop Wescott, J. G. Machen, R. A. Torrey, just to mention a few well-known names. For further study of the Lutheran doctrine the students are referred to only one source book, namely, Martensen's *Christian Dogmatics*, though in a "General Bibliography" also Dorner is mentioned, but not the title of his *Dogmatics*. In general, the reader of the book is favorably impressed with the instruction that is here offered, since the writer endeavors to set forth the fundamentals of the Christian faith according to the traditional church teaching. There is also much historical material and much that belongs into the field of Comparative Symbolics. With regard to the Lutheran doctrine of the Real Presence, Mr. Hammond writes: "It is a modified form of Transubstantiation which hesitates to say that the substance of the elements is changed and yet would like to do so. It comes from an undue emphasis upon the words, 'This is My

Body'" (p. 228). Nothing, of course, is farther removed from Lutheran teaching than this. About Baptism the writer says: "The Lutheran doctrine agrees with the Roman in holding an *ex opere operato* view, but attaches the '*operatus*' to the Word of God associated with the sacramental action" (p. 221). Here again the author errs, for while the Lutherans teach the efficacy of the Gospel also in Baptism, this is not understood as an *ex opere operato* efficacy, but as one coming from the Holy Ghost, who is indissolubly connected with the divine Word and always works in and through it. In a Preface the author warns that the "booklet is only introductory" and "must be supplemented by more extended study if full justice is to be done to the topics of which it treats." It should by all means be supplemented by more extended study of Lutheran dogmaticians in order that the incorrect presentation concerning Lutheran teaching in this handbook may be corrected and the students may learn what the Lutherans really teach.

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER

Thy King Cometh. Sermons Preparing for the Lord's Supper. By Fred H. Lindemann. Published by Ernst Kaufmann, Inc., New York. 144 pages, 5½×8. \$2.00.

It is a disagreeable task when a reviewer is called upon to write an unfavorable review when both the author and his subject matter are of a kind which would incline the reviewer to speak a word of commendation. Pastor Fred Lindemann in his book *Thy King Cometh* is offering "sermons preparing for the Lord's Supper" in the form of homilies. He has written a preface of ten pages, giving his view of the place, the prominence, and the importance which the Lord's Supper should be given in the Lutheran church service. He says: "Our Lord gave only one directive as to what His believers were to do when they gathered for corporate worship. This sole directive is to eat and drink to His memorial. . . . As the people learn again to understand the Lord's Supper more fully and to use it properly and know its power from experience, they will not be content with only an occasional Celebration. As they recapture the art of Christian worship, they will instinctively sense that the sermon was never intended to be the climax. The realization will dawn that the sermon is part of The Liturgy preparing for the Lord's Supper. As the process of patient education continues, the congregation will discover that a chief service on Sunday morning without the Holy Communion is a headless torso, a form of worship that ends prematurely before reaching the climax towards which the whole liturgy aims." "The chief service on Sunday morning without the Holy Communion a headless torso"! A torso, having no head, is a lifeless thing. Applying such a designation to a church service in which the Word of God is preached but Holy Communion is not administered is denying the all-sufficiency of the spoken Word to create, sustain, and strengthen faith. That such a thought was in the author's mind is borne out by another statement also found in the preface. Speaking of the historical and liturgical use of the sermon, he says that the sermon is merely "a preparation for the Lord's Supper, as a part of The Liturgy that leads up to the point when Christ comes and the Real Presence is experienced." [Italics our own.] Christ is said not to come through the sermon, but after the sermon through the Lord's Supper. All this is contrary to the plain teaching of the

Lord, our Savior, Himself. He says: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," Mark 16:15-16 a: "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life," John 6:63; "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth My Word and believeth on Him that sent Me, hath everlasting life and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life," John 5:24; "Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem," Luke 24:46-47. Perhaps the author is not willing to admit the implications of his statement, for in one of his sermons he says: "We eat when we believingly and thoughtfully read God's Word or have the Gospel applied to our hearts through a sermon. But the *most satisfying eating* [italics our own] is done when we not only hear that Christ died for us but also proclaim His death and our confident faith by eating the Body given for us and drinking the Blood shed to establish the covenant of forgiveness," p. 120. But even here the author harks back to his previous statement when he says that "the most satisfying eating" is when we partake of the Lord's Supper. The author also says: "In the end, the Sacraments effect nothing that the Word does not effect. But it has pleased God to tie certain effects of the Word to the Sacraments. So we say and believe that these effects are produced in us and on us only through the Sacrament," p. 131. What has happened? That which so often has happened in the history of the Church: going from one extreme to the other. The author deplors the fact — so do we — that in many of our churches the Lord's Supper is not frequently administered and that many church members commune very seldom. In this they are not responding to the Lord's invitation and are not following the example of the early Christians, nor even of the Christians in the days of Luther. But instead of pointing out the great blessings of the Lord's Supper and the Lord's urgent invitation to receive these blessings and thus persuade the Christian to use the Sacrament of the Altar more frequently, the author exalts the Lord's Supper at the expense of the spoken Word.

Let us exalt the Lord's Supper, administer it frequently, encourage our Christians to commune often. If the Lord's Supper were administered every Sunday in our churches and every Christian would commune every Sunday, that would not be too often and would be pleasing to the Lord. But let us refrain from making a distinction between the means of grace which the Lord Himself has not made, and let us not exalt one at the expense of the other. And let us beware of becoming legalistic in our approach to this matter.

J. H. C. F.

Valiant in Fight. By B. F. C. Atkinson. The Inter-Varsity Fellowship, London. 192 pages, 5×7½. \$2.25.

The author correctly explains that in publishing this book it was not his purpose to write a detailed or technical history, but to give some account of God's dealings with His people in the past in the hope that it might prove an inspiration to Evangelical sacrifice today, give encouragement to our witness, and afford guidance in our stand for truth. He pleads for a courageous response to Christ's great Gospel commission to His disciples and recounts

the fortitude with which they bore witness to the truth in the past, in the face of severest opposition.

He describes the persecutions of the believers by the pagans in the early Church and later by papal Rome and others. In these days, when Rome pitifully laments the imprisonment of some of her churchmen, it may be a sobering exercise for her to remember that she herself has prepared the pattern for such things and worse. And whereas Geneva has long since erected a monument to Michael Servetus, Rome has never repented of the burning of John Hus and of countless other martyrs, nor has she to this day officially renounced her past policy of religious intolerance and oppression.

The author has weakened his case by a number of inaccuracies, some of minor, others of greater importance. Without any criticism, for example, he repeats the story of Luther's alleged experience on Pilate's staircase. More seriously, he declares that "Luther was never able quite to rid himself of a veneration for images." He fails in his attempt to explain the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. He manifests no appreciation of the services of monasticism to the growth of the Church. Nevertheless, for a rapid review of some salient facts of church history and a useful reminder of some things Protestants and other friends of freedom should never forget, this little volume may provide a few profitable hours of reading.

L. W. SPITZ

The Life of God in the Soul of Man. By Henry Scougal. Edited with a historical introduction by Winthrop S. Hudson. The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1948. 95 pages, 5×7½. \$1.50.

The booklet provides a reprint of a tiny work by an Anglican Scottish pastor of two hundred and fifty years ago. It has been reprinted innumerable times and has had great vogue among Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Methodists. Winthrop S. Hudson, who is now president of Colgate-Rochester Divinity School and president of the American Society of Church History, has provided an adequate and thoughtful introduction.

Scougal died when only twenty-eight years old. He had been a parish pastor near Aberdeen and professor of divinity at Aberdeen's Kings College. His booklet purports to be three letters to a friend on problems of faith and life. Unusually penetrating and helpful is the first chapter, "On the Nature of True Religion." This is as fine a statement as we have outside the New Testament of the contrast between natural life and religion, and "the life which is hid with Christ in God." The remainder of the work consists of definitions of and methods for developing the traits of the life of God, which are faith, love, purity, and humility. To the Lutheran taste among the methods of achieving these traits the "consideration of the truths of our religion" should occupy a more central position and one preliminary to such activities as "shun all manner of sin," "know what things are sinful," "resist the temptations of sin," "keep a constant watch over ourselves," "often examine our actions," "restrain ourselves in many lawful things," "do those outward actions that are commanded," and "form internal acts of devotion, charity, etc." Pastors will find the booklet useful for thoughtful individuals who are perplexed about the problems of practical Christian living.

RICHARD R. CAEMMERER

A Child's Garden of Bible Stories. By Arthur W. Gross. Illustrated by Rod Taenzer. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1948. 146 pages, 6×8. \$2.60.

Here is one of the most delightful books ever published by Concordia. It is difficult to refer to it without a glow of enthusiasm. Arthur Gross has retold some sixty of the well-known Bible stories from both the Old and the New Testament in a manner that reaches the understanding and emotions of the younger school child. Designed particularly for children from six to eight, it will be welcomed by teacher and parent for the simple and progressive account of man in his relationship to God. According to the publisher, this is exactly the purpose of the book.

Equally important as the simple text are the colorful illustrations by Rod Taenzer. To our knowledge this is the richest book ever produced in Lutheran circles. Through the medium of more than 150 full-color and black-and-white pictures every page is a marvel of artistry and child appeal. The title of the book is not a figment of the author's imagination; it is an apt description of a beautiful book.

ARTHUR C. REPP

Why Do Christians Suffer? By Anthony Zeoli. Van Kampen Press, Wheaton, Ill. 168 pages, 5×7½. \$2.00.

This little volume undertakes to analyze and systematize the many statements of Holy Scripture on the subject of suffering, presenting the matter first in outline form, then more elaborately with Scripture texts printed out in full. For example, it lists an even fifty ways in which the Bible answers the question: "Why do Christians Suffer?" We believe the book can be used to good advantage as a convenient reference in our preaching and sickbed ministry.

O. E. SOHN

